DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 861 PS 022 353

TITLE Community Schools: The Bruner Foundation's Evaluation of the New York State Community Schools Program. A Report.
INSTITUTION Bruner Foundation, Inc., New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Dec 93
NOTE 84p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Attendance; *Community Schools; Curriculum Development; Elementary Education; Health Services; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; *School Effectiveness; Social Services; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS Integrated Services; New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

A 3-year evaluation was conducted of the New York State Community Schools Program (CSP) in New York City Public Schools. The goals of the CSP include better, more developmental, challenging, and enriched curricula and more time on task, leading to improved academic outcomes for children in Community Schools. The goals also include school-site brokering of comprehensive health, nutritional, and social services at such schools for children and their families. The evaluation found that although attendance had improved at schools implementing the CSP, few of the goals of the program were being met. Curricula for children in Community Schools was similar to those in non-CSP schools, and there was no evidence for improved academic outcomes for children in Community Schools. Although health, nutritional, and social services were available to children and their families in Community Schools, non-CSP schools also provided these services to a similar degree. The evaluation results suggest the need for: (1) increased technical assistance to Community Schools to improve academic outcomes; (2) increased collaboration between state and city agencies to improve social and health services provision; (3) extended academic programs; and (4) the implementation of valid student achievement measures. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED 373 861

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

The Bruner Foundation's Evaluation of The New York State Community Schools Program

A Report

Michael Holzman, Project Director

The Bruner Foundation, Inc.
560 Broadway
New York, New York 10012.

December, 1993

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Janet Carter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

PS 022353

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The New York State Community Schools Program Characteristics

The New York State Education Department defines the goals of the Community Schools Program by a set of characteristics. These are:

Curriculum and Instruction

- *a developmental curriculum which assures progress in basic academic skills and which provides challenge and enrichment;*

- *an instructional program which increases time on task through flexible use of time beyond the conventional school day;*

- *an elementary program that begins early (at least pre-K), and secondary programs that provide intensive and sustained support throughout early and late adolescence; and*

- *instruction which makes creative use of technology.*

Staffing

- *a diversified program team, including teachers, teaching assistants and/or aides, parents and/or other adult mentors, college-age students, etc.*

- *administrators capable of exercising educational leadership and of coordinating a wide variety of educational, social, health, recreational, and other services.*

- *principals, teachers, other staff members sharing in the planning with the school program and enjoying substantial autonomy in carrying out their decisions; and*

- *staff which continually seeks ways to improve and extend its program in the interests of children.*

Collaboration and Support Services

- *a school that brokers health, nutritional, and social services for its children and their families.*

- *a school that serves as a site of educational, cultural, and recreational activity for children, families and the community;*

- *productive linkages with local community colleges, higher education institutions, business, cultural and community based organizations, churches, temples, and other social agencies; and*

- *a school in which parents are actively involved, helping their own and other children in pursuing their own education.*

School Facility Area

- *a building that is open and accessible to children all year, from early morning to late evening, at least six days a week; and*

- *a school that provides a clean, safe, and friendly environment conducive to teaching and learning.*

Service

- *a school that provides service to the community.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Table of Contents

Summary and Recommendations 3

Introduction 5

Summary of the Findings 11

The Findings 14

- Curriculum and Instruction 14
- Professionalism of Educators 39
- Service 51
- Community Involvement 62

Conclusions 71

Methodology 74

Note 82

Summary and Recommendations

The Bruner Foundation has sponsored a three-year study of the New York State Community Schools Program (CSP) in New York City public schools. This is a report of the Evaluation, including the New York State Education Department's defining characteristics for its community schools; the findings of the Evaluation, arranged according to those characteristics; and recommendations intended to be applicable not only to New York State, but generally for school-sited programs of comprehensive educational, social, and health services. This report also includes a summary of the Evaluation's methodology.

The New York State Education Department's Community Schools Program's goals include better, "more developmental, challenging, and enriched" curriculum and more "time on task," leading to improved academic outcomes for children in Community Schools; and school-site brokering of comprehensive health, nutritional, and social services at Community Schools for children and their families.

The Bruner Foundation's Evaluation has found that attendance has improved in New York City Community Schools. It has found that there has been more "time on task" for learning for some children in New York City Community Schools, but not for all; that curriculum for children in Community Schools has not been better, "more developmental, challenging, and enriched," than that experienced observers have seen in similar New York City schools; that there is no evidence of improved academic outcomes for children in New York City Community Schools; that there are health, nutritional, and social services for Community Schools children and their families, but no more so than knowledgeable observers believe are common in other New York City schools; and that the "brokering" approach to school-site comprehensive services was not effective in this instance.

Recommendations

- Technical assistance to help Community Schools become schools where all children meet appropriate national outcome standards.

- Fully-funded extension of integrated school academic programs, increasing learning time for all students attending Community Schools, each day, each week, all year.

- Collaboration among State and New York City agencies to deliver basic, social, and health services to the students and their families at each Community School, mandated by the Governor and the State Legislature.

- The definition and implementation of valid and reliable student achievement assessment measures, performance tasks, asking students to demonstrate what they know and what they can do in the major subject areas.

Introduction

Efforts to educate all children to a level hitherto aimed for and reached by only some children bring us to look at schools in their wider social context. We may then wish to modify our educational system in such a way as "to bridge the social and cultural gap between home and school" (in the words of the New York State Education Department), to provide at the school the basic services as well as the support needed for bridging that gap: acculturation, and techniques for teaching and learning as best we know how. One instrument for attaining this goal is the community school, open from early morning to late at night, all week, all year, providing extended best practice in teaching and learning and all other services needed by its students for the achievements desired.

The Community Schools Program of the New York State Education Department has been such an effort. It was described, when the first awards were announced in a March 7, 1988 press release from the State Education Department, in the following terms: "Funds will be used by pilot schools to develop programs in distressed communities which coordinate a wide array of educational, social, health, recreational, and other resources to help students improve their performance."

> Schools participating in the program will be open from early morning to late evening at least six days a week and will operate on an extended school year. In addition to spending significantly more time on instruction, schools will provide homework assistance, tutoring, and other enrichment activities. The longer school day will also enable working parents to become more actively involved in the education of their children and to enroll in adult education programs.

The first point about the New York State Education Department's Community Schools, in this first public notice of their existence, was that they were public schools that were open longer than others, in order to spend "significantly more time on instruction" (which was later, referred to as "more time on task"). In addition—after providing more instructional time—it was said that the Community Schools would "provide homework assistance, tutoring, and other enrichment activities." And the "longer school day will also enable working parents to become more actively involved in the education of their children and to enroll in adult education programs." Instructional time was to be increased; tutoring and enrichment activities were to be added to that increased instructional time; and parents were to be involved with school life.

Another paragraph of the announcement listed additional Community School activities.

> The schools will provide support services, including day care and latch key services, along with related social and health services including nutrition, drug prevention activities, and counseling adapted to each student's needs. In offering this expanded array of services to students and their community, the schools will not necessarily provide the services themselves, but will coordinate services available from already existing State and local agencies, as well as from community-based organizations.

Again, the rationale for these activities is that they follow from and support the educational mission of the schools.

Similarly,

> Schools are also expected to become centers for community activities aimed at improving student performance. Teams of mentors consisting of teachers, retired individuals, college students, and high school students will tutor elementary school students and encourage them. Local businesses will be invited to participate by sponsoring a school or allowing employees to work with teachers and other school officials.

Districts were invited to enter competitions for funding, which could result in awards from the State of over $100,000 per school per year.

The Community Schools Program of the New York State Education Department has had a complicated history. It began long before that 1988 press release, in the early 1980's, with discussions of community education and how anticipated empty school rooms might best be utilized to benefit local communities. From that time to this it has been housed in many sections of the State Education Department, under many names, and has had many leaders and goals. The chart on the next page summarizes this record.

Summary of the New York State Education Department Community Schools Program Administrative History

Year	**Program/Agency**	**Features/*Goals***	**Program Head**
1983	Continuing Education	Community Education	Garrett Murphy
		Business Partnerships *Schools as Safe Havens* *Schools Supporting Communities*	
1986	Planning	Community Schools	Claudio Prieto
		Extended Days *Day Care/Health Services*	
1987		Community Renewal Grants	
1988		Schools as Community Sites	Nancy Croce Candido De Leon
		(Gould Foundation Technical Assistance)	
1989	School Improvement	Community School	Glorine Edwards
		Hub for all Services required by students and their families	
1990	School Improvement	Community Schools	Lester Young
		Improved Academic Performance	

This institutional history may in itself have been a factor in the development of the Community Schools Program; for example, it is a question whether in such a context the Community Schools Program was ever sufficiently a priority of the State Education Department to mobilize the resources and attention necessary for such a complex and challenging undertaking.

The Bruner Foundation's Evaluation of the New York State Education Department's Community Schools Program has gone about its task by means of a consideration of the effects of the Community Schools Program as discernible in those New York City elementary schools first funded as Community Schools. This document reports the findings and conclusions of the evaluation, and includes recommendations made on the basis of those findings. It is important to note that this is not a report about the schools themselves. The method used by the evaluation was specifically designed to treat daily life in those schools as the "ground" from which the "figure" of the program might emerge, as the first question of any evaluation is whether, in fact, anything (or anything out of the ordinary) actually occurred. This report concludes with a fairly detailed description of the evaluation's methodology, but readers may find it useful to have a brief description of that methodology before considering the findings.

Those findings are based, in the first instance, on observations in a number of schools, over time, by multiple experienced observers, trained in a variety of traditions. The resulting chronological observation record has been supplemented by papers from teacher research seminars, and a statistical analysis of standard data streams made available to the public by the New York Public Schools, including reading and mathematics scores, attendance statistics, and similar data. The observations and statistical analyses have been supplemented by an analysis of the historical development of the Community Schools Program, interviews with school personnel, community school district administrators, union officials, officials of the State Education Department, people from community-based organizations, foundations, and those with similar responsibilities in other cities and states. Only a relatively small part of this data is presented in this report.

The observers contributing to the Evaluation included classically trained anthropologists, education ethnographers, educators working in the tradition of Patricia Carini's long-term studies of children, and others. Some of the observers visited individual schools a few times a week; others, over the three years of the study, used different data collection strategies, spending days at a time in individual classrooms, or visiting many schools from time to time, talking with teachers, administrators, and parents. Some of the observers convened teacher-research seminars at school sites. Others conducted interviews with State Education Department officials in Albany and New York City, as well as interviews with New York City schools administrators at all levels, members of Community School advisory committees, representatives of community-based organizations and other groups associated with the Community School sites in New York City and elsewhere in the state. Some observers took particular care to develop relationships with Community School coordinators, who were interviewed frequently and at length. The observers had among them more than a century of experience with the New York City schools. This latter point has some methodological importance, constituting a framework for analysis and an authority analogous to that underlying the HMI (Her Majesty's Inspectorate) tradition in Britain. The observers not only noted what they saw and heard; they made judgments about what they saw in the schools under observation. The judgments of such highly experienced and well-trained observers can be taken as authoritative in matters of good practice, expectations, and what might be considered to be normal or surprising in a New York City public school. The judgments are also themselves data, in other contexts, which the Evaluation has utilized in order to reach a more rounded understanding of the implications of the Community Schools Program initiatives.

There were approximately two hundred site-visits made by members of the Evaluation's staff. (A listing is available with other technical information at the Bruner Foundation.) There were regular staff meetings of the observers and others involved in the Evaluation and regular meetings of the Evaluation's Advisory Committee, members of which also contributed observations about the Community Schools Program, its context, similar programs in New York and elsewhere. Deliberate efforts were made to test the observations and judgments of each observer by those of other observers, and to test the observations and judgments about various aspects of the Community Schools Program as manifested in particular schools with observations and judgments in other schools. (Tis is in accordance with the principle that intensity of knowledge is privileged over "coverage," when sufficient effort is made to protect the validity of that intensity from mere eccentricity and local accidents in the data.) ERIC and other databases were explored in relevant subject areas, foundation and education officials in many states were contacted for information that concerning collaborative social service initiatives, educational reform, the theory and practice of school change.

Observations were completed in June, 1992. Data concerning the observations were compiled and converted to computer-readable form, then edited in order to standardize formats. A million word selection of this material was then arranged chronologically into the basic Chronological Observation Record. The Chronological Observation Record was not coded, but was directly converted into the working text for the Oxford Concordance Program, which was programmed to produce key word in context concordances from the Chronological Observation Record. The key words were drawn from the New York State Education Department's list of characteristics of Community Schools, and from other lists suggested by the Advisory Committee and from an analysis of terms in the total vocabulary of the Chronological Observation Record. For example, the words "parent," "parents," and "parental," were used as keywords, so that every instance of their use in the Chronological Observation record was retrieved, in chronological order, with indications of the observer making the record, the date of the record, and the school observed. A few cases of keywords of no seeming relevance were also run, in order to test the comprehensiveness of the analysis. This technique allowed chronological sampling of the observations, across sites and observers, so as to achieve an intersubjective account of the Community Schools Program as it appeared in New York City elementary schools over the time of the study. The quotations in the text of this report are—often particularly colorful—samples of that comprehensive ethnographic data base, chosen to illustrate the findings of the observers.

The Bruner Foundation believes that this combination of participant and non-participant observer ethnography, historical, statistical, and critical analysis is a promising methodology for evaluation of programs in education and social services.

Summary of the Findings

The New York State Education Department's Community Schools Program has had a number of discrete sets of goals, identified as characteristics, a canonical fifteen of which were listed in a November, 1991. An evaluation of the information about the Program can be summarized under the State's headings of Curriculum and Instruction, Staffing, Collaboration and Support Services, School Facility Area, and Service.

Curriculum and Instruction: The observations and other data concerning the Community Schools Program in New York City elementary schools collected and analyzed by the Evaluation have been identified some important successes—notably in the Early Childhood areas and the enrichment of curricula with a thematic approach. On the other hand, the findings do not support a definitive statement of success for the Community Schools Program in regard to the goal of achieving "A developmental curriculum which assures progress in basic academic skills and which provides challenge and enrichment" for all students. Looking across the various schools to consider the effects of the Program as a whole, rather than the variations attributable to individual schools, the curriculum offered is not, in general, developmental, challenging, or enriched. The observations of experienced observers show no evidence of improved academic outcomes attributable to the Community Schools Program. The measures used by the State and the City—the Degrees of Reading Power test and similar measures of reading and mathematics, such as the PEP tests—have been repeatedly challenged. They may be valid, but, on the other hand, many knowledgeable observers think they are not. An agency that predicates funding on improved academic outcomes has the responsibility, if it has the power, to put in place valid and reliable means by which outcomes can be measured. This has not yet been done by the New York State Education Department.

Concerning whether the Community Schools Program has "increased time on task (sic) through flexible use of time beyond the conventional school day," observations indicate that this has not been the case across sites and in a way attributable to the Community Schools Program. Some children, in some schools, may have experienced an increase in the time they spend on school work, but most children, at most of the schools observed that were funded by the Program, have not. (The term "time on task" is controversial. It is used here because it is used by the New York State Education Department, as noted above, in a literal sense: the amount of time available for learning.) The third instructional goal of the Community Schools Program is to have an elementary program that "begins early (at least pre-K), and secondary programs that provide intensive and sustained support throughout early and late adolescence." The Community Schools Program has been successful in encouraging schools not already participating in the State Education Department's pre-Kindergarten program to do so. (The Evaluation was unable to collect evidence in New York City concerning "intensive and sustained support throughout early and late adolescence," nor was it able to compile any observations concerning efforts to put this in place: all those sites observed were elementary schools, offering programs for elementary school-aged students and adults.) The final instructional goal of the Program is to encourage "instruction which makes creative use of technology." Here, too, there seems to be little, if any, discernible effect of programmatic activities to this end, whether concerning new, computer-based technólogies. Nor were older instructional technologies, which for the purposes of this analysis are construed broadly to include instructional strategies and the use of textbooks and trade books, improved by the Community Schools intervention.

Staffing requirements and goals for the Community Schools Program include: "a diversified program team, including teachers, teaching assistants and/or aides, parents and/or other adult mentors, college-age students, etc." Each school studied has had a Community School advisory committee and these committees have included teachers, administrators, representatives of community-based organizations and local governmental agencies, and parents. (None of those observed have included college-age students.) These committees have typically begun as quite broadly representative groups--liaisons with other institutions and stakeholders—declining in numbers, frequency of meeting, and responsibility over the period studied. Each school has had "administrators capable of exercising educational leadership and of coordinating a wide variety of educational, social, health, recreational, and other services." Some of these were regular school site administrators, some were Community Schools coordinators. There has been some, but little, Program-wide support for school-site administrators in these novel areas of responsibility. The history of the Community School coordinators, as a group, also shows little Program-wide support, and a pattern of radically changing State expectations. Typically, the first Community School coordinators were described by observers as employed outside the career-pattern of the New York City public schools, working with great dedication with little support, then either resigning from the school system, exhausted, or leaving their particular schools to take more clearly defined positions with the New York City Board of Education, but outside the Community Schools Program.

Principals, teachers, other staff members in some schools "have shared in the planning of the school program and enjoyed substantial autonomy in carrying out their decisions," particularly at those schools involved with the New York City public schools school-based management, shared decision-making initiative. Those principals, teachers and other staff members in schools not involved with that initiative were not more than usually autonomous, nor were their schools unusually typified by shared planning. There has been no Program-wide school change initiative observed. Nonetheless, some staff at the schools of the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program have "continually sought ways to improve and extend its program in the interests of children," as is the case at many schools in New York City and elsewhere.

The schools funded under the New York State Education Department's Community School Program are expected, under the heading of *Collaboration and Support Services*, to be brokers of health, nutritional, and social services for its children and their families. Many of the Community Schools coordinators and school-site administrators attempted to implement this delivery strategy. By and large, the strategy has been unsuccessful. The typical student at a New York City school serving as a site of the Community Schools Program received very little if anything more in health, nutritional, and social services than a student would at other New York City Schools.

The Community Schools Program has encouraged schools it has funded to serve as sites of educational, cultural, and recreational activity for children, families, and the community," and to become "organizations that formed productive linkages with local community colleges, higher education institutions, business, cultural and community based organizations, churches, temples, and other social agencies." They have emphasized these matters, as they have emphasized parental involvement in the life of the school; emphases that are, at least partially attributable to their status as grantees of the Community Schools Program. Whether this involvement has resulted in progress toward the end of the "parents being actively involved, helping their own and other children in pursuing their own education," is less certain.

The school buildings in question have been open longer each day, and more days each year, than before (although not "open and accessible to children all year, from early morning to late evening, at least six days a week), and, all things being equal, would be "conducive to teaching and learning," (of course, other things are not equal). And to the same extent as many other schools in the city, they provide *service* to the community.

These, in sum, are the findings of the Bruner Foundation's Evaluation of the New York State Education Department's Community Schools Program as observed at New York City sites, keyed to the fifteen characteristics, or criteria, listed by the Department at the end of 1991. The following section presents these findings in detail.

The Findings

The New York State Education Department's 1991 groupings of that year's formulation of the "characteristics" of Community Schools, came under the general headings of:

- Instruction
- Professionalism of Educators
- Services for Students
- Services for the Community
- Community Involvement
- Service

The first of these that we will consider is the category of *Instruction*. As it has evolved, the tendency of the Community Schools Program has been to give increasing emphasis to this category, often referring to it under the name of academic achievement.

Instruction

The Regents' Criteria that can be grouped under the heading of *Instruction* include:

1. A developmental curriculum which assures progress in basic academic skills and which provides challenge and enrichment.

2. An instructional program which increases time on task through flexible use of time beyond the conventional school day—afternoons, evenings, weekends, summers, etc.

3. School buildings open and accessible to children from early morning through the evening, at least six days per week, all year.

4. Elementary programs which begin in early childhood (at least pre-K), and secondary programs which provide intensive and sustained support throughout early and late adolescence.

13. Instruction which makes creative use of the new learning technologies.

14. A school that provides a clean, safe, and friendly environment conducive to teaching and learning.

By means of these criteria for Instruction in Community Schools, the Regents envision schools that are open and active all year, at least six days a week, each day from early morning into the evening; schools housing instructional programs that are developmentally appropriate, flexible, enriched, challenging, making creative use of new learning technologies and offered throughout the regular and extended hours these schools are available to students. This is an ambitious agenda for creating outstanding public schools in some of the nation's least advantaged neighborhoods, an agenda that offers the possibility of an educational experience there usually available only to the most privileged of our children. It is, in its way, an agenda based on a simple counter-factual argument. If, now, many schools are not educating children (*these* children) well, and if those schools are open only a limited number of hours each day, five days a week (hardly more than half the year); and if those schools are assumed to now house instructional programs that are developmentally inappropriate, bland, unchallenging, rigid, and employing few if any new learning technologies; then reversing this description will present the possibility of better educating the children. And who is to gainsay this? The research on summer learning loss alone is enough to justify the prescription, and there is much more than that in the research literature to point to the wisdom of this first set of the Regents' Criteria for Community Schools.

The first feature in this set, "Criterion 1," is:

A developmental curriculum which assures progress in basic academic skills and which provides challenge and enrichment.

The Regents chose to begin their 1991 list of criteria with a reference to curriculum. This marked a considerable change from the emphasis of the Community Schools Program planners in the early 1980's, who had looked out from the school to the *community* as their focus. Beginning with curriculum begins with the very center of schools as state institutions. State education departments, particularly that of New York State, have historically concerned themselves with curriculum. It is an area over which the State Education Department has considerable power, and one in which it has considerable authority. The Regents' desired curriculum for Community Schools has four characteristics:

- It will be developmental;
- It will assure progress in basic academic skills;
- It will be challenging;
- It will be enriched.

These are four very different types of statements. They might be taken as a sequence implying a theory: If a curriculum is developmental, challenging, and enriched, then it will (at least) assure progress in basic academic skills. If it turns out that the data show that these Community Schools meet the criteria, we might then be at an appropriate point to consider the validity of the theory's causal assumptions. For the moment, though, let us grant the theory as a framework for presenting the data.

Developmentally Appropriate Curriculum: Some of the Community Schools have in fact offered a developmentally appropriate curriculum in the Pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten, and other Early Primary grades. In some cases these are exemplary program—well-equipped, served by dedicated staff. A characteristic of the Community Schools is the good impression of some of these programs carried away by even the most casual of observers. The children are actively engaged in learning; classrooms are lively, yet not ill-disciplined; the teachers seem deeply interested in their work and satisfied by it. Some of these Early Childhood programs are among the most pleasing aspects of the Community Schools.

Our question, though, concerns the efficacy of the Community Schools Program, as a State initiative. Considered in that frame of reference, these programs cannot be attributed solely to the Regents' Community Schools initiative. In most cases they pre-exist it. They speak well of a long-term, intense effort by the State Education Department's bureau responsible for early childhood education and comparable efforts by the New York City Board of Education. Their incorporation into the criteria of the Community Schools Program shows an appreciation of these efforts by the Regents. It points to a laudable strategy of identifying "what works," in general, in education, and encouraging schools hosting Community

Schools Program activities to use these approaches. And yet, it must be said that this is not a universally successful area; and in some cases where the Pre-Kindergarten programs *are* successful, they are operated independently of the remainder of the school and their good practices do not extend to all the Early Primary Grades. In others of the New York City schools observed, Early Childhood Education is not in accordance with best practice; there is a rigid adherence to subject-area boundaries, the teaching is not child-centered. For example, one observer was troubled to note in a Pre-Kindergarten class that the children were only allowed one color of paint. Returning to the class later, she found:

Play time--children are busy in their various chosen activities. Both the teacher and the assistant teacher help where needed. Children [have]. . . finished puzzles, drawings, Lego car, fancy cap, "new," but . . . easel still has one color-- orange. No one paints and no paintings are displayed. [109101991]

Given the pervasiveness of the Early Childhood, developmentally appropriate, approach to education in the schools of New York State, when it is absent in a Community School, its absence is noticeable by the staff, and, in this case, attributed to an administrative issue:

The teacher . . . feels that an earlier program worked out by the Early Childhood teachers for integrated grouping could have worked, but it was not supported by the administration. She was a Fourth grade teacher herself and knows the difference between Fourth grade and Kindergarten, but feels the principal is not knowledgeable in Early Childhood Education (a fact acknowledged readily by the principal to me at our first meeting). The teacher goes on to say she feels discouraged and unwilling to serve on committees since the staff's wishes are not supported. [109102191]

We might note the lack of any mention of the Community Schools Program or the State Education Department's other programs and policies in this—and similar—accounts of everyday life in these New York City schools funded by the State Education Department's Community Schools Program. These observations indicate not only the absence of a visible, active, comprehensive, approach to developmentally appropriate Early Childhood Education, Program-wide, in the Community Schools, but point to another, crucial, issue: the consequences of a general lack of shared decision-making structures in some of the schools. Generally accepted good practice now supports both these matters, the pedagogical and the administrative. Both are present in *some* of the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program, but not in all. (Although the State made funding available for Pre-Kindergarten classes at all Community Schools.) This would seem to indicate that these good educational practices have not been institutionalized or well-supported by the State in programmatic terms. Observers were also concerned by the influence of State- and City-mandated testing programs of doubtful validity on early primary activities and teaching practices.

Beyond the Early Primary years, that is, from Second or Third grade to Sixth, there is little to indicate that the Regents' Criteria of a developmentally appropriate program has been met in these New York City Community Schools. Just as it is often attested that the early years are well-planned and well-taught—with some exceptions—so it is that reports by observers and other indications frequently point to a marked decline in standards of good practice in the later years in some of the schools. As one observer put it in a school-site report:

[T]he early childhood classes . . . [show an] integrated learning philosophy and cooperative groups . . . In contrast, the upper grades are teacher-directed, based on a "factory model" of the 1970's. [10161692]

Many (but not all) Fifth and Sixth grade classes in these schools are typified by severe tracking and "teacher-centered" forms of classroom organization, by a gradual decline in attention to affective matters to the point that it is unfortunately common for teachers of ten and eleven year-old children to be heard addressing their students in terms and at volumes not in accord with good practice. Of course, these behaviors are not universal, nor limited to upper grade classes in these elementary schools. It is distressing that some primary teachers are also given to negatively demonstrative behavior:

The teacher shouts "Put you head down!" "Sh-sh." These "sh-sh-s" are heard often. The teacher loudly calls out names of children to admonish. [109102191]

On the other hand, there are classes, Fourth Grade and higher, where affective and pedagogical good practice *is* followed. One observer was quite taken with the tone and content of a Sixth Grade class:

6th grade . . . Children appear rough, big, sloppy, energetic, but in control. The program in Science has been on a study of water—water power, water pollution, conservation, evaporation, tides, tidal waves, etc. I arrive at the end of the Science period. The teacher advises class of schedule of rest of day and special program to follow that wheel. All are interested. Also advises children of math exam today. Tells them exactly what to expect—gives examples. Reminds them "We have been doing all this, remember?" Teacher then suggests "Let's do it today so I don't have to bother you with it again." Offers pencils to those who need them. Some children restlessly move about. Teacher counts "1 . . . 8" and all is now fairly quiet and orderly. I see evidence that the group has been studying UNICEF and its services. This is "Homework to Admire" and also "Cooperative *group work" on an "Imaginary Country"—with maps, languages and other characteristics of the land and its people. Also on display is some work done on "segregation," "What people require for survival," self-portraits, and "Landscapes and Uses of a Park." (A formidable program in so short time!)* [109102991]

Given the nature of the school populations in question, many of which are drawn from groups not traditionally well-served by the schools and many of whom are not native speakers of English, Special Education and Bilingual Education classes are of particular interest. Unfortunately, observers were unable to find examples of developmentally appropriate teaching and learning in these classes. One observer wrote the following concerning a Bilingual class:

[This] is the bilingual teacher for the fifth grade. When I observed him he was leading the entire class in practice exercises for the impending city-wide math tests. The aim had been written on the chalkboard: remedial math—adding and subtracting decimals. The lesson was conducted in English. He seemed to be a rather inexperienced teacher, and a bit insecure in teaching the topic. Some of the explanations provided to the students were confusing. He does seem to enjoy positive relations with the students. [1014192]

(Among other things, this is an instance of the effect of mandated, non-performance-based tests on instruction.) Another observer recorded the following scene:

Class 4-4B, Bilingual: This class is being taught by a substitute . . . who usually works in the library. Seventeen children are present this afternoon, and she is reading with them from a book about Martin Luther King. No Spanish is spoken while I am there, except for a couple of times when the teacher seems to feel that they are not following her directions and chides them briefly in Spanish. "Go Sweetheart, Very Good!" she says, as she sends two boys over to the globe to find Atlanta, "in the state of Georgia." Simultaneously she points to another child who continues reading. [It is a] "wonderful book," the teacher announces after a paragraph, and calls on one of the many waving hands for the next reader. The walls are covered with vocabulary cards and admonitions about the peculiarities of English. "Remember, possessive nouns!" is one of them. The children are just at the point where the book speaks about Martin Luther King as a minister's son, but I am wondering about how many of the kids are sure what "minister's" means, much less that it is a possessive noun. The children are eager to read, hands waving in the air every few paragraphs. They read with a certain fluency, but it's unclear how many of them know what's happening in the story and the teacher does not ask any questions that would indicate this. Many of them read without punctuation. At one point a bossy girl interrupts another girl who is reading: "STOP, with the points!" she commands, referring to the periods. "I can't understand you this *way!"* [10211289]

These are some of the more positive fieldnotes on Bilingual Education as it occurs in the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program.

We can summarize these and other observations from the Evaluation on this topic to the effect that there were instances of developmentally appropriate curricula observed at the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program, but there was no evidence that a developmentally appropriate curriculum is widespread, equitably available, characteristic of the Community Schools Program itself and not simply a manifestation of parallel or pre-existing initiatives in individual schools.

...provides a challenging and enriched curriculum: A definition of the curriculum extending beyond basic skills might be summed up in the Regents' phrase: challenging and enriched. There are aspects of the Community Schools programs that *are* challenging and enriched and some of these are initiatives closely tied to the Community School initiative. One of these is the thematic curriculum program offered by the College of Human Services (now the College of Audrey Cohen). Another is the collaboration between Community Schools and independent (private) New York City schools.

The College for Human Services' association with schools in New York City has been a principal means for curriculum development associated with the Community Schools Program there. The execution of the College of Human Services program varies from site to site, its success apparently contingent on the effort made at each site and perhaps other individual variables. Observers found that classes with the program are, in general, more enriched and challenging than those without it and that it is more successful when operated on a multi-grade basis than when isolated. The program encourages good practice in a number of areas: thematic curriculum; cooperative learning; performance assessment; inter-age peer tutoring; individualized materials and strategies for teaching and learning; an emphasis on writing; cooperative teaching among school staff and others.

Here are some observations concerning the College for Human Services programs in the New York City Community Schools:

An observer noted as early as December, 1988 that the College for Human Services was at that time working with Grades Five and Six at Elm Street Elementary School. In an August, 1989 report, another observer noted that the College for Human Services was working with Fourth Grade teachers in the school. In October, 1989 an observer commented that *"Fifth Grade teachers are working this year in a weekly after school curriculum project with the College for Human Services . . . [which] was apparently recommended by the technical assistance team from the Gould Foundation. . . The College for Human Services theme—law—is supported by after-school drama program meetings with teachers, etc."* Throughout the period of observation, the College for Human Services program was reported as a positive contribution at Elm Street Elementary School.

On the other hand, in November, 1989, an observer at Pine Street Elementary School reported being told that *"Last year's College for Human Services program was an exercise in disconnected programs and not working very well but the College for Human Services aide/facilitator is skillful . . . teachers [are] working to link State-mandated curriculum to College for Human Services proposals—constructive actions, concrete projects, relevant trips"*. More neutrally, notes from Oak Street Elementary School in July, 1990, state that *"Fifth and Sixth Grade teachers [are] involved with College for Human Services, additional teachers appraising interest in expansion . . . a curriculum developer reported that the College's human services curriculum provided focus for elementary school curriculum development."*

In November, 1990, it was reported—somewhat ambiguously—from Elm Street Elementary School that *"the College for Human Services wanted to restructure the whole school curriculum according to its plan"*. In the same month, another observation on College for Human Services efforts at Elm Street Elementary School, stated that *"It offers curricular and educational experiences outside the traditional mold, utilizing thematic, interdisciplinary and constructive action approaches"*. Again, we have less positive observations from Pine Street Elementary School, where in November, 1990, an observer commented that the College for Human Services *"activities [are] terrible!"* and were indicative of an issue with the school—*"there is no planning, things just happen"*. An observer at Oak Street Elementary School in March, 1991, however (or, nonetheless), cited the College for Human Services sessions *"as one of the few places teachers at that school talked about teaching and learning."* Back at Elm Street Elementary School, in June, 1991, an observer noted that Fifth Grade teachers there were still participating in *"the initiative run by the College for Human Services, which is a highly structured curriculum involving what they call constructive actions"*. (This observation may pertain to the "service" component of the Community Schools Program characteristics, as well.)

At the beginning of the 1991-1992 school year, in October, an observer at Elm Street Elementary School expressed the idea that the College for Human Services did not understand the needs of teachers there and *"work-shopped these people to death"*. In the same month, an observer at Oak Street Elementary School noted that the College for Human Services program had begun at that school with two Sixth Grade classes, then in the second year, *"added grades Five and Six, then Four and Five, planning to add Third, also, and have included [it] in the after-school program as well"*. In January, 1992, an observer at the same school wrote that *"teachers who have been trained are continuing to use the College for Human Services program: Fifth and Sixth grade studying Mayans and the rain forest, for example"*. The following month an observer was *"very positively impressed"* with College for Human Services work at Oak Street Elementary School, *"thematic curriculum, community action by Sixth Graders—helping little ones"*. And final comments from the period of observation include one from Elm Street Elementary School in May, 1992, that by then *"the College for Human Services [is] not really working with the teachers in any concentrated way"* and—in a change in the pattern of evaluatory comments—a positive summary comment from Oak Street Elementary that *"The College for Human Services offers ideas and techniques which can, or should, stimulate teachers to develop alternative approaches to isolated lessons in subject areas."*

The College for Human Services effort was observed at three of the New York City schools funded by the State program: Elm, Pine, and Oak street schools. It could be supposed that the variations in perceived quality of the College for Human Services programs--largely positive at Elm Street Elementary School, less positive at some of the other sites--could be attributable to variations in the quality of the training offered at the sites. Therefore, various observers attempted to document College for Human Services teacher workshop sessions, but the College refused permission to do so. The College for Human Services did not return telephone calls in this regard, nor reply to correspondence.

(Other observations concerning thematic curricula include two in January, 1990, at Pine Street Elementary School, where it was noted that the Reading Recovery specialist used a thematic approach, and that the school's Curriculum Committee recommended a thematic approach with Social Studies and Whole Language instruction. In April, 1992, an observer at Oak Street Elementary School described a unit that *"called itself The Pacific Primary School, and, according to their publication, teachers [in that unit] plan together in Thematic Modules"*. The following month, this observer commented: "I *have seen thematic work done at this school and on display in the multi-cultural* *center."* In October, 1992, an observer at Oak Street Elementary School wrote that *"The principal had asked all of the staff to begin thinking of ways to approach curriculum areas through overall thematic subjects, and to submit to her ideas of a theme a month each teacher might like to focus on.")*

Concerning curriculum in general—apart from the College for Human Services effort—the record begins with an observer at Pine Street Elementary School in January, 1989, stating that *"The principal said that the school is trying to have a print-rich curriculum with an emphasis on the library, even though there is no money for a librarian."* In March, 1989, an observer at the school wrote that *"There was clearly a Reading and Writing curriculum and the work that was displayed emphasized this fact."* The record in this regard for the 1988-89 school year ends with a note from June, 1989, when an observer stated that *"Classroom teachers at Elm Street Elementary School are involved with the [Community School] project in several specific ways, and curriculum innovations have been experimented with on a limited basis."*

Observations for the 1989-1990 school year are taken up in October, 1989, when an observer at Elm Street Elementary School noted that *"The theater team has many good ideas about using the fifth grade curriculum in their improvisational work with the children."* In January, 1990, an observer at Pine Street Elementary School thought that the teachers were *"developing curriculum by trial and error."* Back at Elm Street Elementary School, an observer in March, 1990 noted that: *"The director of the Early Childhood Center makes a pitch for having trips that are keyed to the curriculum and points out that sometimes one grade doesn't know what the other is doing."* Later that month, an observer at Ash Street Elementary School found that there the *"Curriculum is based on integrated learning—the teachers are trained and are working closely with a staff developer... The curriculum is approached through many modalities—print, music, art—the teacher and leader meet for two weekends"* to plan this. In May, 1990, an observer wrote that *"The new Community School coordinator is greatly interested in curriculum and staff development, and sees an opportunity to focus on academic improvement as the Community School goal"* at Elm Street Elementary School. Two days later, another observer at the school *"sensed some friction between [the Community School coordinator] and teachers, who may think doing the curriculum is their job."* And in June, 1990, an observer at Cedar Elementary School wrote that a *"nationally-recognized community service expert... [was helping] teachers and students develop community service projects integrated with the curriculum."* (This was not connected with the College for Human Services project. It was a Gould Foundation initiative.)

During the third school year of observation, in Fall, 1990, an observer at Pine Street Elementary School found *"regular meetings on grade levels with two or three teachers* *to discuss what the curriculum requires, what is actually covered, and how they feel that the children are learning."* Reports from Pine Street Elementary School in the first few months of 1991 noted that *"The teachers plan together for many areas of the curriculum . . . teachers have become more aware of curriculum planning for reading, writing, and mathematics."* In May and June, 1991, there were field notes from two of the elementary schools, concerning the arts. At one, they were *"teaching the required Fifth Grade curriculum through the arts,"* while at the other, there was a teacher *"involved with the Corridor Program, which uses arts in the curriculum."* In October, 1991, an observer at Oak Street Elementary School found in the *"Fourth Grade [there is an] integrated curriculum centered on Health, with a school-wide health fair project."* On the other hand, in November, 1991, at Oak Elementary School: *"The teacher tells me there is no music in the curriculum--except when Arts Connections comes and prepares a show . . . One Fifth Grade teacher is working on the Mexican Mayas and rain forests with this integrating curriculum aspect in mind."* In January, 1992, an Oak Street Elementary School observer wrote that the principal *"has begun to request regular monthly meetings with cohort grade groups so that teachers will be encouraged to work together to share program curriculum ideas and materials as well as methodological approaches,"* nonetheless, the *"curriculum is deadly in the early grades"*. On the other hand, in February, 1992, we learn that *"One marvelous teacher at Pine Street Elementary School takes every course available to enhance her curriculum, teaches social studies through a novel; children did story boards from the novel in small groups."* By March, 1992, at Oak Street Elementary School *"The rain forest curriculum has been concluded and the class is embarked on a study of the three W's—the teacher tells me—whales, women and the West Indies,"* while, by contrast, *"the principal spoke of the poor quality of the early childhood program."* In May, 1992, there was planning for a *"Performing Arts curriculum for fourth and fifth grade, to be put into place in the 1992-1993 school year."*

We might conclude this set of findings about curriculum with a summary statement from Oak Street Elementary School, in July, 1992, concludes that despite some positive indications of curricular work at the school, *"In this school there appears as yet, no common understanding, no agreed upon general approaches to both children and curriculum. Each teacher is free to develop his/her curriculum as he sees fit, being governed only by District and State prescribed general curriculum areas, material and texts . . . The upper grades are richer and generally more interesting in the flow of ideas, though there is great variation in the way curriculum develops in these grades."* This statement must be modified when we are looking at the curricular programs across those New York City elementary schools participating in the Community Schools Program.

At three schools, it was observed that staff development help from the College for Human Services promoted the idea and practice of integrated curriculum. At least one school was strongly influenced by this effort. At other schools, there were a variety of influences at work, sometimes including the College for Human Services, resulting in a scattering of thematic and integrated curriculum efforts. However, the curriculum as experienced by the average student in these schools was that delivered by individual teachers, and was unlikely to be either unusually enriched, or particularly characterized by integrated or thematic approaches. There was no evidence of a systematic effect attributable to the Community Schools Program.

... wbicb assures progress in basic academic skills: The Regents' requirement that the Community Schools assure progress in the academic skills (apparently seen as following on the provision of a developmentally appropriate, challenging, and enriched curriculum) seems straightforward and easily measured, but has turned out to be exceedingly difficult to approach.

Bruner Foundation observers found a complex situation in regard to student progress in academic skills. Their judgments were generally divided, as with the program itself, between a more positive impression of the Early Primary and Primary program and a less positive impression of progress in the later grades. (Although in at least one school these impressions were reversed, with a perception of relatively poor progress in the Early Primary program and better teaching and learning in the upper grades.)

In sum, although there are bright areas in these reports, particularly in regard to the teaching of reading in the Early Primary grades, for children who remain in the Community Schools into their fifth or sixth grade, observers were unable to report that progress is "assured," and given the uneven provision of curricula that were developmentally appropriate, challenging, and rich, it would have been even more difficult to have reported that progress, if present, would have been attributable to the presence of these elements of the Community Schools Program Characteristics.

An analysis of the standardized test data reported by the New York City public schools also indicates that absolutely; relative to other, similar schools; and relative to all schools in New York City; the Community Schools have not assured progress in academic skills for their students, as measured by these tests. Nor were there found in the schools other measures in general use that would indicate the achievement of this goal.

The next criteria that may be grouped under the set of *Instruction* characteristics of the New York State Education Department's Community Schools Program are

Criterion 3,

School buildings open and accessible to children from early morning through the evening, at least six days per week, all year;

Criterion 14,

A school that provides a clean, safe, and friendly environment conducive to teaching and learning;

and Criterion 2, that once open, Community Schools should offer

An instructional program which increases time on task through flexible use of time beyond the conventional school day—afternoons, evenings, weekends, summers, etc.

Underlying the third of the Regents' Criteria is the desire to have schools function almost literally as community centers. This is one of the central rationales of the Community Schools Program. It is based on the common observation that many of our neighborhoods lack centers; that children, in particular, may need sanctuary. This is fairly dramatic in the case of some of the New York City Community Schools. They may be among the very few intact buildings on their blocks. The streets around them may be unsafe. Housing conditions in the area may be sub-standard. Clean, well-maintained school—and all the New York City Community Schools are clean and well-maintained—potentially are safe houses for the children. This is an excellent, if fairly minimal social policy goal. However, in practice, it is not met.

Nonetheless, the New York City Community Schools observed *are* clean, safe, and they are open and accessible to children more than they were. This is partially a function of the Regents' initiative, partially because of efforts by the Chancellor of the

New York City Public schools on behalf of all of the city's schools. All the schools housing Community Schools programs are frequently open from normal school opening to mid-afternoon. Some are open early, some are open in the evening, most have at least limited Saturday programs, all have at least a few weeks of summer programs, but

None of the New York City Community Schools are open—as the Regents Criterion requires—throughout the summer and many are not open during significantly additional amounts of time during the regular school year.

What occurs in the schools during these extended hours? Let us first look at the data concerning after-school programs. Do the Community Schools deploy an "instructional program which increases time" for instruction during those afternoons?

Observers' notes from January 1989 at Pine Street Elementary School state that the *"after-school program at the present time is run by [a settlement house and a local community-based organization]";* by March, there is an after-school program reported at the school itself, but its nature was unclear: ""There *are lots of ideas for after-school and extended-day classes that would involve kids and their families; for remedial homework sessions, but nothing's happened yet."* Two months later it is reported that there is in fact an after-school program underway at Pine Street Elementary School. The reports include these observations: *"Some of the children are anxious to be in an after-school activity . . . A parent has been hired to assist in the after-school program . . . Many of the staff are in the after-school program, which is helpful, since they know the children, the building, the parents, etc. . . There is a special program in the after-school-program—Alternative to Special Education—which serves children from the First through the Sixth Grade."* Later in the month we learn that *"The Community School-funded program Studio-In-A-School is an art program for the entire school and the after-school program as well . . . The children in the after-school program are working jointly on a box kite, now that all the individual kites are finished . . . some children are making collages in the after-school program."*

Studio-In-A-School, an extraordinarily impressive, popular, and highly visible program, is one of the very few initiatives associated with the Community Schools Program as manifested in the observed New York City sites, where activities during the regular school day were continued into the after-school program, thus increasing instructional time in the desired manner.

Another observation informs us that *"The assistant principal has a large group of children during these after-school programs to rehearse* ***Oliver Twist***, *"* from which we can gather that in Spring, 1989, there *was* an after-school program underway at Pine Street Elementary School, that teachers from the school participated in that program, and among its activities the arts figured prominently. The following November, there is a report from the same school that *"The instrumental music program was to have been a day-time school program, but now it is part of the after-school program,"* which is consistent with the earlier pattern. In January, 1990, an observer at Pine Street Elementary School notes that the *"assistant principal was in charge of the after-school program and when he was out, the aide was left in charge,"* but by then the *"Community School coordinator and the Guidance Counselor are in charge of the after-school program in his place."* The following Fall, an observer at Pine Street Elementary School reported that *"The after-school program has changed its focus as a result of parental pressure . . . the enrichment program is no longer present in the after-school program,"* having been replaced by supervised homework and tutorials.

Tutoring is a common aspect of the Community Schools Program as actually instituted at the New York City sites. It is commonly performed as the center of the after-school program, and occasionally also takes place in the summer. In regard to this, the agenda of the first Community School coordinator at Pine Street Elementary School spoke of *"Afternoon and Saturday programs [that] could include extended Studio-In-A-School; Hands-On-Science; Reading and Math Labs; Theater and Chorus; Peer Tutoring; Photography; School Newspaper; Computers; Dance; etc."* It was noted in this document that the peer tutoring program *"should begin by February 1st, [1989],"* and would be supplemented by tutoring by senior citizens. In late January, 1989, an observer recorded *"changes in the school, according to the principal and the Community School coordinator: there is peer tutoring during the school day and after school,"* which was modified at the end of February by the statement that the peer tutoring was then "intergenerational," and further clarified by a note from March that *"There is a peer tutoring program with the Fifth and Sixth Grades going to the Kindergarten to read to the children"* there. In February, 1991, an observer at Pine Street Elementary noted that the *"After school program [is] now only homework and basic skills tutorial; Creative Science and Art [are] no longer offered."* The following month an observer at Elm Street Elementary School recorded that the *"Homework and tutorial program after school [took place] in an attractive,* *newly equipped library."* And, finally, a comment from May, 1992, from an observer at the Pine Street Elementary School: *"[A]fter school program cut . . . it will be reduced to a custodial function for younger children, tutorial for older."*

At Elm Street Elementary School, in June, 1989, the *"nearby Junior High School, the prior [Community School Program] site, which is across the street, continues to run after-school, evening, and Saturday programs."* The following school year, in October, 1989, an observer at Elm Street Elementary School reported that *"[T]he newly assembled library, a splendid physical space that is also used for a number of the children's after-school programs . . . Fifth Grade teachers are working this year in a weekly after-school curriculum project with the College for Human Services."* There are reports in December, 1989, from Elm Street Elementary School, of an after-school computer class, as part of the Community School program. However, the *"after-school skills program . . . is in disarray,"* according to a teacher-observer. But, again, in November, 1990, an observer at Elm Street Elementary School reported *"a substantial after-school program, three days a week, until 4:45 p.m."*

An observer at Ash Street Elementary School wrote in March, 1990, that *"there are twelve teachers in the after-school program, plus a para-professional and a family assistant, who works with the parents . . . there are ninety children in the after-school program . . . in place of dinner in the after-school program, there is a snack . . . After-school has its emphasis on academics, since the teachers of the day program are also in the after-school program,"* and, significantly, *"Kindergarten-First Grade after-school is an extension of the school day."* At the end of June, 1990, an observer at Cedar Street Elementary School wrote that *"Thirty children are enrolled in the after-school program; the same staff is employed [as during the day], providing great continuity of staff and space."*

The after-school programs in the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program were infrequently mentioned in 1991 and 1992 Chronological Observation Record. Among the few observations are one from April, 1992, when an observer at Oak Street Elementary School wrote: *"I learned from the Community School coordinator her concern that the after-school program be one of enrichment, activity, and experientially-oriented, for parents as well as children"* and in May, an observer at Pine Street Elementary School reported a plan *"to extend the after-school program to five afternoons and possibly Saturday."*

Tutoring was not noted in the earliest period of the Community Schools Program's activities at New York City sites, but eventually became quite widespread, serving, as it were, as the extended instruction option of last resort in at least five of the schools.

What can we conclude from these and other observations concerning Community Schools Program activities responsive to the Regents second Criterion, that provision should be made for ***an instructional program which increases time on task though flexible use of time beyond the conventional school day*** in afternoons and evenings?

First, the schools, as facilities, all *were* open during the afternoons. (It has been noted that this was in large part made possible by a coincident effort of the Chancellor of the New York City Public Schools, who successfully negotiated extended school opening hours with the system's custodians.) Secondly, after a slow start, there *were* instructional programs supported by Community Schools Program funds during those times. In an least one school, those programs were primarily oriented toward the arts; in more than one school, regular school faculty taught in the afternoon programs; however, for most of the period covered, in most of the schools, the afternoon programs were devoted to homework and tutorials. Evening programs were not much in evidence. When mentioned, they are associated with programs for adults. And, finally, there is some—but very little—evidence that afternoon programs were coordinated with the regular instructional program. In other words, in some schools, during some terms, some students were able to receive certain types of additional instruction at their Community Schools, but it has been either rare or unknown that a school's instructional program has been restructured to take advantage of the additional possibilities for instruction allowed by afternoon openings.

Concerning weekends, with one exception, all the references to Saturday programs in 1988 through 1991 are to the private school cooperative program at Pine Street Elementary School. (That exception is this: In October, 1991, an observer at Oak Street Elementary

School reported *"Monthly Saturday cultural excursions for children and their families . . . about forty [students] in the Saturday program, all ages, but only for the bright children . . . two groups-one in computer and one in curriculum assistance.")*

One of the most potentially productive aspects of the instructional initiative of the Community Schools Program is the extension of school work to summers. The need for this is well-known. Indeed, among the observations themselves, in this case for the 1990-1991 school year, we find a comment from Elm Street Elementary School in May, 1991, pointing to the rationale of summer programs: ***"We can work and work with them on things like manners or homework, and then they come back after the summer and nothing has changed."*** Children from households where the home culture is similar to that of the culture of schools spend their summers, at least in part, duplicating and extending experiences of the type they have in schools during the school year. Those who come from households where the culture differs from that in the schools spend their summers in differing activities: school learning is lost. Assuming that many of the students in the schools in New York City funded under the New York State Education Department's Community Schools Program live in households culturally different from that in the schools, this component of the program would be particularly crucial. What was found?

The documentation of Community School Summer programs begins with a report from the Pine Street Elementary School Community School coordinator, who reported in December, 1988, that *"Summer Enrichment programs were held for children entering the First and Second grades"* the previous summer. In January, an observer at Pine Street Elementary School added: *"There is a summer session Reading program for the Kindergarten and First Grade children who need reinforcement and they are just a small percentage of the children in the summer session program."* In June, 1989, we learn that at Pine Street Elementary School *"Breakfast and lunch will be served to all children only during the entire summer at no cost . . . There is an active Kindergarten and Pre-School program during the summer from 8:30 a.m."* In July, there is a report that *"The summer session started with sixty children and only three dropped out . . . There was a recreational summer session for children from eight to ten years of age . . . It is projected that the children who are at [a private school] for July will enroll in the recreational summer session for the month of August."* During a meeting in June, 1990, the Community School coordinators from the New York City sites reported that they *"all had summer programs in 1989."*

In October, 1991, an observer at Oak Street Elementary School noted that the *"after-school, extended day, and summer program [was] cut by the State from seven to five weeks* *this year."* And in May, 1992, we learn that at the Pine Street Elementary School, the River Independent School *"weekend program [is] to be terminated as too costly, but the summer program is to be retained."* At Oak Street Elementary School, an observer in June, 1992 wrote that *"The coordinator has had to severely limit activities in summer because of the drastically reduced budget . . . the summer program will incorporate trips to the Bronx Zoo . . . there is no homework in the summer."*

Most of the schools reported summer programs during the school years observed. Most of those programs were extra-curricular. Most of those programs served a minority of their school populations. There were few indications that instructional time for education for most students was extended by this effort, few indications that the Community Schools Program itself was effective in this regard.

There was a notable exception to these problems with the week-end and summer programs at the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program. This was the River Independent School's program with Pine Street Elementary School. The cooperative Community School/Independent School programs began as an initiative of former Mayor Edward Koch, who challenged the New York City independent schools to help strengthen public education. From this challenge came efforts at cooperation between the public and private sector, cooperation that led to some quite attractive results. This aspect of the Community Schools Program as it has evolved in New York City is highly suggestive. It was, in a sense, fortuitous, a nearly random suggestion of a mayor taken up by the independent schools themselves just at the time that the Community Schools Program was coming into being—a coincidence, perhaps, highly dependent on the peculiarities of New York education and politics. It does, however, illustrate what can be done when chance opportunities are seized. And yet, the "Bridges to Learning" experiment, no matter how attractive, was unique in the Community Schools Program. It is also important to note that it was in large part underwritten by the cooperating independent school and therefore, although facilitated by the Community Schools Program, was not properly part of that program. And, unfortunately, the Saturday and Summer programs at River Independent School were neither open to all Pine Street Elementary School students, nor integrated with their regular instructional program. And they eventually were severely cut-back, due to financial and administrative difficulties at Pine Street Elementary School. "Bridges to Learning" was an extraordinary effort. The *typical* New York City Community School has had an after-school program emphasizing homework, perhaps tutorials, often the arts and recreation (and programs for adults). Saturday and Summer programs tend to be restricted to arts and recreation, although here again "Bridges to Learning" was unusual in that it provided one group of students with a program that included science and other basic studies.

We can say in summary that, in regard to this set of criteria, all the New York City Community Schools *are* open longer hours, more days, and during the summer. Most, but not all, are open in the evening; most, but not all, are open on Saturdays. All have summer programs. Some of the Community Schools, but not most, have Saturday *instructional* programs; most of the Community Schools, but not all, have afternoon instructional programs (the others have recreational programs available in the afternoons). Some of the Community Schools, but not most, have summer instructional programs (the others have recreational programs available in the summer). None of the New York City Community Schools have had full afternoon, Saturday, or summer instructional programs that were *integrated* with that offered in conventional school times, and in every school there are clear demarcations between "the school program" and "the after-school program" and "the summer school program." However there *are* schools where segments of the after school program reinforce aspects of the school program, usually in the form of supervised homework sessions, but occasionally in more creative ways. Almost all of these extended services are directly attributable to the Community Schools Program. The extended hours of use of the school facilities are also, in part, attributable to the Community Schools Program. But the Community Schools Program has not been observed to have succeeded in extending the amount of instruction received by all students enrolled in New York City schools funded by the Community Schools Program.

The fourth Criterion of the Regents Community Schools Program Characteristics, and the fourth among those that can be grouped under *Instruction*, is that Community Schools Program sites should have:

Elementary programs which begin in early childhood (at least Pre-K), and secondary programs which provide intensive and sustained support throughout early and late adolescence.

The observations indicate that, after a slow start, the Community Schools did offer elementary programs "which begin in early childhood." As noted above, the early childhood programs are often a significant strength of the Community Schools. The lack of programs for adolescents is, from one point of view, simply an artifact of the circumstance that all but one of the New York City Community Schools studied were elementary schools. From another point of view, that lack is a manifestation of the substitution of "mainstream" concepts concerning the Community School Program for an earlier, Mott Foundation-inspired, community education concept. The New York City schools studied were elementary schools that were the sites of the Community School Program-funded activities. It is within that rather narrow definition that they are called community schools.

The last of this cluster of criteria is Criterion thirteen:

Instruction which makes creative use of the new learning technologies.

"New learning technologies" is a phrase that can be taken as referring to computer-based technologies and those utilizing such devices as video disks and CD-ROM devices. Most of the Community Schools have "computer laboratories," rooms devoted to the installation of class sets of computers. As with issues related to the physical fabric of the school building, the common journalistic critique of the state of urban schools does not wholly apply in these schools: just as they are well-maintained, so are they, to a lesser extent, well-equipped. The issue, in the first analysis, as it were, is the use—creative or not—of that equipment.

Just as it is good to have books gathered in library rooms, better to have them freely available, and best to have them also distributed about the school, so it is good to have computers and other electronic technologies gathered in special rooms, better to have them freely available, and best to have them also distributed about the school. In general, the Community Schools do have computer rooms, but these resources are often not freely available and are rarely distributed about the school. Most importantly, they are not always integrated into the dynamic of teaching and learning in the schools. On the other hand, there is some excellent teaching done in the computer rooms in the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program: heterogeneously grouped, student-centered, aimed at the development of particular skills and the learning of specific types of knowledge. Here are two accounts from quite different schools:

Classes 4-1 and 5-3B (Bilingual) in the Computer Room: It is impossible to see into the computer room from the hallway, since in addition to the multiple locks on the door there is a heavy metal grate over the window. Inside, 25 children sit at monitors working on Logowriter with an amazing combination of concentration and excitement. I observe an hour of each of the two groups. Class 4-1, despite being the highest grouping, has the reputation of being a difficult class, while 5-3B is "full of wonderful children," according to the Computer teacher, who is also in her third year as the UFT Chapter Chair. Right now, she is serving as a mentor teacher to a young man in his second year of teaching. To an outsider, both these classes look wonderful.

The children never leave their seats, nor do they call out except occasionally when they need help and are very excited. Some of them are working in teams of two, others work alone, but consult frequently with their neighbors; others work alone. The younger teacher moves up and down the rows of computers, bending over to talk quietly with individuals, only addressing the whole class when it is time to pass in their diskettes. Two Fifth Grade boys seem delighted when the mentor teacher asks them to show me how they can program whatever they want to work on. Neither of them speaks much English, and my conceptual grasp of what they are doing is very limited, but they demonstrate beautifully. After I leave them to observe on the other side of the room, they come and get me twice to show me something else they are working on. (The other aspect of the school, where children consistently show such concentration and pleasure in their activity, is in the elaborate school programs done on various cultural themes. But that discipline—and the product—is completely different and there is no such dimension of initiative and self-directed work as here.)

A Fourth Grade boy shows me the program he is writing to get an astronaut to the moon. The mentor teacher tells me he has spent three months on this in the afterschool program. She is very low key with the kids, making her comments to me in a manner such that they don't even notice. She doesn't particularly praise them, rather suggests the next thing that they might want to try. The mentor teacher's eyes move constantly around the room, even while she is explaining something to me, and she often moves to a child's side before his or her hand goes up to ask for help. The children laugh and talk to each other, but every single person seems engaged in the work. [10231490]

At another school:

Computer 2:00 p.m.: On my way out of the science room I encounter a boisterous group of Sixth graders entering the near-by computer room. Once again a loud voice attempts to check their behavior. One child is taken aside by the computer teacher who talks quietly directly to him outside the room. I can hear nothing of her rather earnest communication as I enter the room. These rough and rowdy youngsters gradually find their assigned . . . it appears as if they are assigned . . . places at the computers, all of which are shared among three or two children. While they are settling, a young, second, computer teacher has been quietly demonstrating some things on a plastic covered board with a marker. The earliest arrivals and those nearest to her have been watching and listening while the later arrivals have noisily settled themselves. During all this time, the young teacher has maintained her quiet voice and continued without interrupting what she was demonstrating. Soon all are very attentive as she asks if they know why she cannot use the regular chalk board in this room. Someone does know and the young teacher explains it further. Now the computers are turned on and all focus on the ones at hand. All this time I have been standing at the door with the older computer teacher, who, I believe, is in charge of this room. She has been telling me that "It's Friday. But this is a very difficult group anyway." I inquire if these children have always been "difficult" in former years, and learn that the "graduating" Fifth grades. . . only two were divided in such a way upon entering Sixth grade that all those with difficulties were placed together willy nilly by the administration with no teacher input into the process. As we talk we are both watching the children and the younger teacher, who has a very soft voice, doesn't seek to control, yet captivates everyone's interest. Silence never reigns, nor does she require it. [109101791]

All around the country, wherever there are enough computers to fill a room, we see these teaching methods. In schools where there are enough computers so that students are able to do most of their school work with them, these teaching methods supersede the teacher-centered methods of the older technology. Students working under these conditions appear to enjoy school, to cooperate with one another, to learn rapidly. Although the question of the identity of the new technology employed under these circumstances is a nice one—Is it the computers themselves, or is it rather the unusual forms of classroom organization that they support?—the association is strong.

In addition to the two lengthy descriptions quoted above, technology, in the form of computers, makes many other appearances in the Chronological Observation Record (one hundred fifty-four citations of the words "computer" and "computers"). We see, for example, that in December, 1989, a teacher at Elm Street Elementary School *"is very interested in the changes occurring among her students who are attending the after-*

school computer class that is part of the Community School program." In February, 1990, she spoke of the *"Differences that she has observed in youngsters taking the computer class: they are more independent—they find it easier to take initiative."* The following month, we find that at Ash Street Elementary School there is a *"computer program [that] meets twice a week . . ."* While at Oak Street Elementary School, in the same month, an observer found *"a reading lab, fully equipped with computers for the IBM Write to Read program,"* in this case, the computers were available for children. In June, 1990, an observer reported that at Cedar Street Elementary School, the *"extended programs have included academic assistance, science discovery, 'Mommy and Me' computer classes, cultural workshops, peace education/conflict resolution, parent workshops, literacy components."* The schedule for Second Graders at Oak Street Elementary School in November, 1991, included: *"Music on Mondays, Studio-In-A-School on Wednesdays, Computer on Thursdays, Recreation or gym on Fridays."* In February, 1992, an observer at Oak Street Elementary School wrote that: *"The para-professional Computer teacher tells me one First Grade teacher has wanted her to do away with everything but computers and expand the work with computers."* And in a report dated April, 1992, we catch a glimpse of a teacher at Elm Street Elementary School *"guiding a class of students, who were using math and reading software on the computer."*

In contrast to these encouraging developments, an observer reported from Pine Street Elementary School in January, 1992, that *"now there is no computer program . . . due to staff cuts [although] . . . computer adult education programs continue,"* and in June, 1992, we learn that the *"Computer teacher has retired and not been replaced . . . Computer room practically bare."*

In most schools in New York City that serve as sites for the Community Schools Program, there is a relatively minor part of the day spent in computer-assisted, student-centered conditions of teaching and learning; most instruction is teacher-centered, whole class, homogeneously grouped; print resources are poorly distributed and ineffectively utilized. There are, of course, wonderful exceptions. There are no indications that these exceptions are attributable to the State Education Department's Community Schools Program.

Curriculum and Instruction

The Regents' desired curriculum for Community Schools has four characteristics: it will be developmental; it will assure progress in basic academic skills; it will be challenging; it will be enriched. These statements might be taken as a sequence implying a theory: If a curriculum is developmental, challenging, and enriched, then it will (at least) assure progress in basic academic skills. The theory may be true, but as the education provided to students in New York City schools funded under the Community Schools Program has not always been developmental, challenging, and enriched; and as it has not assured progress in basic academic skills given the measures used by the schools to make a determination of such progress; and as those measures are not valid and may not be reliable; it is not possible to claim success for the Community Schools Program in this regard.

If the Community Schools Program is to achieve its instructional and curricular goals, the following are indicated:

Recommendations

- Fully funded extension of integrated school academic programs, increasing learning time for all students attending Community Schools, each day, each week, all year.
- The definition and implementation of valid and reliable student achievement assessment measures, performance tasks, asking students to demonstrate what they know and what they can do in the major subject areas.

Professionalism of Educators

Let us go on to another group of criteria that the Regents have selected as desired characteristics for the Community Schools Program. The Regents' Characteristics that can be grouped under the heading of *Professionalism of Educators* include:

10. Administrators capable of exercising educational leadership and of coordinating a wide variety of educational, social, health, recreational, and other services.
11. Principals, teachers, other staff members sharing in the planning of the school program and enjoying substantial autonomy in carrying out their decisions.
12. A staff which continually seeks ways to improve and extend its program in the interests of children.

The Criteria grouped under this heading cover teachers, administrators, and other staff and convey the Regents' intention that these personnel should be supported so as to develop the capacity to:

- Identify the interests of their students along many dimensions;
- Discover ways to improve and extend programs to meet those interests;
- Decide among those ways which to pursue;
- Plan how to do so;
- Implement those plans, coordinating a range of programs.

The State Education Department is implicitly tasked by these criteria to develop and implement procedures for staff development in these areas.

The first feature in this set, "Criterion 10," is:

Administrators capable of exercising educational leadership and of coordinating a wide variety of educational, social, health, recreational, and other services.

This Criterion is somewhat ambiguous. Is it meant to *include* principals? Is it meant to be *restricted* to principals? Let us assume that the former is the case (this is the minimal interpretation). Then we might ask whether the Criterion is a prerequisite for participation in the Community Schools Program, or whether it is an anticipated outcome? Based on the phrasing of other Community Schools Program characteristics, it was most likely meant to be an anticipated outcome. If that is indeed the case, we could then rephrase the injunction, as directed to the State Education Department:

Principals will be supported so as to be able to exercise educational leadership and to coordinate a wide variety of educational, social, health, recreational, and other services.

We would, then, wish to know, first, whether principals in schools serving as New York City sites of the Community Schools Program are able to exercise educational leadership and coordinate other services, then, whether that ability—and practice—is attributable to the Community Schools Program.

Principals functioning as *educational* leaders is a matter of concern nationally. It is, perhaps, too fundamental an issue to address in this somewhat limited context. But if we are not to be concerned with the role of principals, and other administrators, as educators, educators will risk losing any credibility with the community at large. In order to meet this Criterion, the State Education Department would be expected to have instituted or supported programs insuring that principals in the Community Schools would be among the most respected *teachers* in their schools, conversant with best practice in education for the needs of their students, and would be expected to have instituted programs supporting their need also to be highly competent *administrators*, comparable to executive directors of community centers, or, in a venerable New York City tradition, settlement house directors. (Some contend that principals prefer such responsibilities to more traditional activities.) And, indeed, some Community School principals have developed remarkable administrative skills. And some principals among those leading Community Schools, as elsewhere, are in fact lead teachers for their staffs. But

There is no evidence that there has been systematic support of the development of program coordination and curricular leadership skills among the Community School principals by the New York State Education Department's Community Schools Program.

If the Criterion is read so as to refer not only to principals, but to other administrators, then it would most appropriately include the Community School coordinators present in most of the New York City Community Schools, and here observers noted a significant amount of State Education Department concentration on issues of program coordination. Administrators with particular talents for community-based program development have been hired in many of the Community Schools to serve as Community School coordinators. There have been efforts by the State Education Department to support the coordinators, directly, and particularly early in the program, there were substantial and well-received efforts in this regard by the Gould Foundation under a State Education Department technical assistance contract. However, after the termination of the Gould Foundation's contract, support for the Community School coordinators appears to have diminished. A significant artifact in this regard is the considerable turn-over rate of Community School Coordinators.

Between 1989 and 1992, every school observed had a change in Community School coordinator.

Some scenes from everyday life in the Community Schools, as pertaining to these criteria, follow. The first is a report by an observer facilitating a Bruner Foundation-sponsored teacher-research seminar on evaluation:

The Community School coordinator forgot to send out the reminder notices to seminar *participants. Even though the date had been reserved at the last session and all those present had written it down, the absence of a reminder resulted in everyone being involved in the usual lunch time activities—all of which are commendable. One teacher was meeting with a group of youngsters in the Community Room. Another was eating lunch with a group of her children in a corner of the cafeteria. The principal is officially a member of the research seminar. Her heart is in the right place, but her body is usually doing other things. She was supervising the cafeteria and the inner yard. There was a lot of noise in the building. The rain was keeping the children indoors and they were upset.* [11051689]

The Bruner Foundation-sponsored teacher-research seminar was a particularly rich source for data on school organization. Its activities spanned all the schools observed and extended over three years, providing school communities with an opportunity to participate in the evaluation. The scene just quoted is typical of the view of school life afforded by the seminar. Principals, Community School coordinators, and other administrators were generally supportive of this staff development opportunity. And yet most of the effort of the Foundation's seminar leaders was spent simply in management. There were very few school-site administrators who arranged the routine matters that needed to be attended to for this type of activity. The most significant exception was a school secretary at one site, who, for a time, was quite successful in finding rooms, putting out notices and the like. The observations concerning the seminar and others indicate that it seems that in general the administration of these schools was capable of dealing with everyday life in a routine fashion, but had great difficulty in coping with an unusual structure—bi-monthly meetings of a teacher-research seminar—or with other interruptions of routine.

The next set of quotations is from a discussion between two observers who had recently visited Oak Street Elementary School:

First Observer: *There is a very strong Gould Foundation role in the school; the Elm Street Elementary School administrators "really want it." There is a strongly felt need for technical assistance. The Gould Foundation advisor helps the Community School coordinator with state-mandated reports, reconstituting the Advisory Council—agenda, sub-committees, coordinates [local] political connections. Parental involvement in the Community School is fabulous, an event every week. There is a desire to increase varieties of parental involvement. Parental presence in classrooms is less a matter of academics, "more like visits, perhaps mentoring," also helping with student photographs, raising money for social/political events.*

Second Observer: *The principal is not [a teacher], cannot handle teacher observation paperwork, [she is] strongly connected with [local] politicians. The principal is comfort-*

able with parents, brings them into the school, is not comfortable with teachers. The teachers believe parents are negatively intrusive.

First Observer: *The principal and the Community School coordinator are a strong team, making the whole school a Community School project.*

Second Observer: *Agree, but the principal is [unable] to achieve this.*

First Observer: *Yes, after school, nothing academic. Adult programs: ESL and AIDS education in the morning, GED on Saturdays. Afterschool, theater, sports, and small chess and photo clubs. The Community School coordinator devotes much energy to bringing together community service providers as an Advisory Council, but the point is questionable. The Community School is understaffed from a clerical point of view.*

Second Observer: *Continuous, unplanned whole school activities; the teachers feel over-stretched.* [10882189]

It would appear from this exchange that at least at this time, in one school, the implied Regents imperative that "Principals will be supported so as to be able to exercise educational leadership and to coordinate a wide variety of educational, social, health, recreational, and other services" was not met. At other schools, at other times, principals were able to function both as educational leaders and as coordinators of a wide variety of services.

> It does not seem to have been the case that, where principals did demonstrate skills as educational leaders and as coordinators of a wide variety of services, that they were supported by the State Education Department in the development of those skills; nor did it seem that in cases where those skills appeared to be lacking, that the State Education Department intervened with support.

Rather, principals and other administrators at the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program seemed to exhibit the usual range of such skills that might be expected in a district serving a million students. There may have been intervention in this regard by the State Education Department, but it is indiscernible in the Chronological Observation Record.

The next two criteria in this set of Characteristics having to do with school-site staff are Criterion 11:

Principals, teachers, other staff members sharing in the planning of the school program and enjoying substantial autonomy in carrying out their decisions;

and Criterion 12:

A staff which continually seeks ways to improve and extend its program in the interests of children.

Criteria 11 and 12 (with Criterion 9, above) are in effect endorsements of what is usually known as school-based management/shared decision-making. In order for a "staff . . . [to] continually seek . . . ways to improve and extend its program in the interests of children" it must share "in the planning of the school program and enjoy . . . substantial autonomy in carrying out their decisions." This is the case in those Community Schools that participated in the New York City Public Schools School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making initiative. The following series of observations are from a New York City school that was the only one under observation that opted into the Chancellor's School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making program. They begin with an extended account of everyday life in the school before shared decision-making was instituted, then follow the school into the new management structure.

3.2.90: Meeting of the Principal's Cabinet

First, at 9:00 a.m., the principal talks at length with someone from the District Office. A parent and other outsiders congratulate the principal on the Black History Celebration last week . . . saying that it was a spectacular success. There is a general discussion of day-to-day problems with the Community School District Board, which apparently won't release money to principals who are publicly in support of the Community School District Superintendent. (The Superintendent has been told that her contract will not be renewed, after seventeen years in the position. There is a great deal of concern and activity on this issue among the leadership in the school and in the Parents' Association. Teachers with whom I have spoken seem relatively uninvolved.) Then the conversation shifts to the unfairness of the claim that Elm Street Elementary

School is not eligible for Chapter I funds because 72%, rather than the required 75% of the families fall below the designated poverty level. There is a long discussion of how to help a parent who has just been raped, and what the school could do for a boy whose father just left his family. The principal comments several times that "the nature of teaching is going to have to change because the traditional values just aren't here."

The individuals involved in the cabinet meeting gather slowly; the meeting starts around 10:30 a.m. The group, which has been meeting regularly since late fall, includes the Principal, the Assistant Principal, two Master Teachers, the head of Bilingual Education, the director of the Early Childhood Center, the Teachers Union Chapter chair, the Community School Coordinator, and three classroom teachers (who may also have administrative responsibilities that I am unaware of).

The principal announces that everyone should know what's going on in the building and asks for reports on several new programs: school savings, sponsored by the Dry Dock Bank; plans for Grandparents Day; a Teachers and Writers Collaborative project in one of the fifth grades, which will entail weekly trips to the Metropolitan Museum. Everyone groans and laughs at the logistics this entails, but two people say that they would actually enjoy being the ones to go downtown with the kids. The principal explains that the opportunity is coming to Elm Street Elementary School because the junior high school across the street "couldn't get its act together in the middle of the semester and we say "Yes" to everything!" The principal goes on to discuss how important it is to make use of all special programs. She had talked earlier about how the children have to get enrichment programs now because otherwise "We will lose the children! And, if you wait, the bureaucracy will overwhelm you." Then she adds that with all these things going on, people get in each other's hair. "You are all quasi-administrators and we are ahead on School-Based Management, but the system can get overloaded and collapse." She then launches into several examples of the kinds of problems that she spends much of her day negotiating.

A teacher sitting near me leans over and whispers: "When is this meeting going to begin?" with a grin, referring to the somewhat chaotic agenda.

Several people bring the discussion back to how to design a better system for covering classes and informing everyone when someone wants to take a class trip. The director of the Early Childhood Center makes a pitch for having trips that are keyed to the curriculum and points out that "sometimes one grade doesn't know what the other is doing." The Teachers Union representative reports that she has been called by a union vice president who want to copy the model of the ECC for the children of teachers in another borough.

The meeting is interrupted by the entrance of the Community School Parent coordinator, and four parents, who have been to visit another school, where they made a presentation on the many aspects of parent involvement at Elm Street Elementary School. Everyone asks questions and there is a lively conversation. The Assistant Principal, suggests that the staff get together in ethnic groupings and prepare food for he parents some evening, since "They do for us all the time, and serve us wonderful food, and we should do for them." The President of the Parents Association, hugs him and everyone laughs and claps.

Finally, a teacher reminds the principal of the need to develop a calendar from now until the end of the year and that discussion begins. After a few minutes, however, it is time for people to leave for lunch room duty.

Six months later, the school's management had changed from the principal-centered model depicted above, to a shared decision-making mode.

9.26.90: Meeting of the School-Based Management Team

Twelve people gather at the end of a long hot day; most of them will be at school until after eight this evening because this is an open house for parents. Everyone is anxious that the union not call for a strike right now, but there is little information.

The Community School coordinator opens the business of the meeting by asking what is happening with restructuring. Everyone reports that the prep schedules are better. Two people explain that the mini-schools mean that you can go right to the person you need when there is a problem with a child. Someone asks if the children are aware of who the mini-school directors are. Others respond no, but it is still a better structure for discipline. The directors talk about how incredibly busy they are, how much of what they are doing is new to them. (Two of the three have been primarily classroom teachers; the third is already an administrator. All three are white, non-Hispanic.) There is a long exchange about how to provide lunch coverage without exhausting everyone. People are afraid that children will get hurt on the stairs. The focus shifts to safety on the block in front of the school. There was a shooting this morning and the parents on the team instruct the teachers never to let the children wait outside.

The Community School coordinator informs them that IBM will provide a facilitator to work with the SBM team on retreats and offer staff development sessions during the year.

The meetings are more substantive, already. More people are taking responsibility and getting administrative experience. Predictably, several teachers told me after this meeting *that teachers don't really understand SBM—they think the team is just there to solve their problems.*

And eighteen months later, shared decision-making at the school continued to impress observers.

5.20.92: SBM/SDM Meeting--The meeting was chaired by a Mini-School director. It was a well attended meeting, all of the mini-school directors were present, the parent coordinator, parents, the proposed bilingual mini-school director, the school wide coordinator, Teachers Union representative, and teachers. A principal from another Community School District was also present. It was reported by the Community School coordinator that he had come because the principal had heard good thing about the SBM/SDM team at Elm Street Elementary School. A policeman from the local precinct stopped by to say hello. The team was focused on plans for a school-wide art festival planned by the Studio-In-A-School artist. All of the grades will be involved in the projected celebration. The item was discussed relatively quickly. The logistics for the day were decided upon. A representative from the Studio-In-A-School was present to discuss plans for a backyard mural. It was agreed that the effort should be supported. One of the major issues for the team was the allocation of support positions for the next school year: two mini-school directors [the third will become an assistant principal position], librarian, four para-professionals (CARE I lab, Reading, Math, Science resource), bilingual mini-school director, Parent Resource/Community School position. For the classroom positions, teachers have completed preference forms. It was noted that all of the positions will be posted. The principal stated that she would like to reduce enrollment in the school from six, to five kindergarten classes enrolling no more than 25 students. She stated that she does not want to take any outside of the district students, currently no waivers are being granted by the superintendent. The principal shared that there would be no additional summer programs other the community schools. There will be no Chapter I Summer Primary Program. The principal shared information about the SED Meeting that had been held during the previous week.

Over the period of observation, Elm Street Elementary School developed from what appeared to observers as a very centralized school, with an unusually principal-centered management tradition, into one that appeared to be operating on professional and democratic principles, without significant changes in personnel. This is very impressive, particularly in the historical context of relations between "Livingston Street" and the schools, on the one hand, and those between school-site administrators and classroom teachers, on the other. Both of these have been characterized by a lack of trust and relations of mutuality. It is a tribute to then-Chancellor Fernandez and the strong support he received from such organizations as the Fund for New York Public Education, that so much progress in this regard had been made so quickly. On the other hand,

The observations do not indicate that planning and shared decision-making of this type had taken place in Community Schools not participating in the New York City Public Schools School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making initiative, nor is there evidence of efforts in this regard in support of the schools by the State Education Department.

Criterion 12,

A staff which continually seeks ways to improve and extend its program in the interests of children,

is particularly difficult to assess. It may be taken as given that all school staffs, by virtue of their participation in the teaching profession, can be assumed to meet this criterion. How otherwise could they be called teachers? But given the restrictions on time and support for professional reflection in the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program, it is not altogether obvious that evidence can be found that *programmatic* improvements and extensions were made as a consequence of "continual" staff efforts in this regard. An essential criterion of this ambition calls for mechanisms for programmatic self-assessment to be put in place and supported with technical assistance and appropriate funding. The Bruner Foundation's teacher-research seminar was an effort along these lines, as was the "multiple forms of assessment" program sponsored by the New York City Public Schools, the Fund for New York Public Education, and the Bruner Foundation. There did not appear to be similar efforts put into place by the State Education Department during the observation period. There was not a sense of a *Community Schools Program* commitment to a model of school operation where the "Professionalism of Educators" might be interpreted to mean the functioning of a feed-back loop, as it were, of teaching, performance assessment, and the informed modification of practice.

The Chronological Observation Record shows that there are programs in the schools that do help support school staff and other stakeholders to develop these skills and practices. That implemented in partnership with IBM in some of the schools is one example. The School-based Management/Shared Decision-Making assistance available to some of the schools from the Fund for New York City Public Education on behalf of the New York City Board of Education is another example. These are valuable programs. Unfortunately, they are only available to those schools participating in the Chancellor's initiative, and not all the Community Schools have done so. As with the more or less fortuitous availability of the training in planning from IBM Corporation, the distribution of these resources among the Community Schools has been haphazard and quite dependent on initiative at the school-site level.

Professionalism of Educators

The New York State Education Department grouped three criteria under this heading, criteria which can be summarized as requiring administrators capable of exercising leadership in all aspects of a Community School; shared decision-making; school-based management; and a staff-based process for continual improvement in the interests of students.

The findings of this Evaluation do not indicate that the State has offered adequate support in these areas, nor that there is evidence across schools observed of programmatic effects in this regard. A strong negative indicator noted was the high attrition rate of Community Schools coordinators.

If the Community Schools Program is to achieve its professionalism of educators goals, the following is indicated:

Recommendation

- Technical assistance to help Community Schools become schools where all children meet appropriate national outcome standards.

Service

Another group of Criteria that the Regents have selected as desired characteristics for the Community Schools Program can be grouped under the heading of *Service*. This category includes:

5. A school acting as broker for health, nutritional, and social services, making them accessible on the school site to children and their families.

6. Schools which serve as sites for educational, cultural, and recreational activity for children and their families and for the community at large.

15. A school that provides service to the community.

The Regents envision schools that are not only community center *buildings,* but which function almost as latter-day settlement houses, community centers in the full sense of the word. Observations indicate that the Community Schools Program has been partially successful in meeting this cluster of Regents' criteria at the New York City sites. Let us first look at Criterion 6:

Schools which serve as sites for educational, cultural, and recreational activity for children and their families and for the community at large.

The New York City Community Schools Program sites have devoted significant efforts to achieving this Regents' Criterion, particularly in regard to cultural and recreational activity. (Presumably the regular academic and instructional program of any school would satisfy the first clause of this criterion, in so far as it relates to children.)

In general, the schools *are* open to the communities, *do* act as sites for cultural and recreational activity for "children and their families and for the community at large" ("community" in the sense of people living in the surrounding area).

Concerning *recreation,* we find that at Oak Street Elementary School, Second Graders were offered "recreation or gym" on Fridays, in November, 1991, while Third and Fourth Graders had those options on Mondays, and Sixth Graders enjoyed them on Tuesdays. And in July, 1992, an observer noted that among the additional *"programs . . . going on for which teachers were responsible"* were *"recreation and gym."* In general, the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program have *"serve[d] as sites for . . . recreational activity for children . . ."* There is much less evidence that they have provided recreational and other services for *"their families and for the community at large,"* although some schools have provided some services along those lines.
In sum,

Recreational programs for students have been well-developed at most of the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program, both in the afternoon and on weekends, and particularly during the summer. The recreation programs have generally been a significant success of the Community Schools.

(It should be noted in regard to these activities, that many of them are also present in other New York City Public Schools, and would have taken place at the schools in question, whether or not they had received State Community School designation.)

The schools are also sites for *adult education* programs, varying, from site to site, from experiments with elaborate and admirable intergenerational literacy and computer familiarization programs to simple provision of the Board of Education's Adult Basic

Education classes. It is common for school districts to provide education services for adults. These usually include programs preparing adults who did not graduate from high school for the Graduate Equivalency Diploma (GED), and, as preparation for that, literacy programs, usually referred to as Adult Basic Education (ABE) and English as a Second Language (ESL) classes. As early as December, 1988, observers found GED and ESL classes for parents at the Early Childhood Center facility of Elm Street Elementary School. In January, 1989, there were *"several adult education programs"* at Pine Street Elementary School, and the following March, an observer at Pine Street Elementary School noted that *"GED and ESL are going on, but there is nothing remarkable about them,"* and continued in that vein in June, commenting *"As for adult education and programs for parents, such as job training, [they] are on hold. . ."* In August, 1989, another observer at Pine Street Elementary School noted that the local Community School District's Adult Education Office was housed in the school, and an observer at Elm Street Elementary School found some *"Adult programs: ESL and AIDS education in the morning, GED on Saturdays."* The following March, an observer at Ash Street Elementary School reported *"Services for parents: GED program meets twice a week; computer program meets twice a week; and there are job training programs, but not at this site."* In May, 1990, the Elm Street Elementary School Pre-Kindergarten director [said] *"she is in charge of the ESL and GED programs . . . [that, after the establishment of the Community Schools Program] were expanded."* In November, 1990, it was reported that at Elm Street Elementary School there were *"pre-natal classes, classes in parenting skills and building self-esteem, and four GED classes, funded by the Adult Basic Education budget."* An observer found GED classes at Pine Street Elementary School in December, 1990 and September, 1991, while in October, 1991, an observer at Maple Street Elementary School was told that ABE and GED programs there *"have almost tripled this year,"* and at Cedar Street Elementary School, an observer was told that *"The Community Schools project has made after-school programs, Liberty Camp summer school, and Adult Basic Education programs possible."* On the other hand, the same month an observer at Oak Street Elementary School reported that Adult Basic Education there was *"[New York City Public Schools] Board [of Education]-funded"* and the next month added that *"The Adult Education classes are placed there by [the New York City Public Schools] Board of Education and are unrelated to the school."*

It is generally acknowledged that other things being equal, children from non-normative groups, whose parents are involved with Adult Basic Education activities, have more positive attitudes toward school than those from similar populations who do not have similar models. Inter-generational programs are a further step in this direction. Education is as much a cultural value as an economic resource; social networks valuing and active in education ease an individual's entry to and retention in schooling. For groups with home cultures, or "ways with words," significantly different from that of the normative groups in a society, acculturation activities involving adults facilitate teaching and learning for children. Toward this end, an innovative intergenerational computer class was attempted at one of the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program during its first years. The program was unsuccessful, for reasons that are not easy to identify or relate, but in any case it was neither revived nor imitated.

More conventional provision of education for adults varies widely among the Community Schools, dependent as it is on the individual initiative of coordinators. Schools have received little help in the design and funding of Adult Basic Education programs. Some of them experienced significant delays and unsatisfactory fulfillment in the siting of Board of Education classes.

Cultural programs, particularly those with a folkloric orientation, have been a specific emphasis of some of the Community Schools. The following is a representative report from one of the Evaluation's ethnographers at a school in a primarily Hispanic section of New York City.

Puerto Rican Discovery Day/Community School Day

The auditorium fills, class by class, at 9:00 a.m. Noise swirls everywhere, but the children are orderly and having a good time, excited about the program. The principal is welcoming everyone and showing the special guests to seats in the front of the auditorium, which has extremely bad acoustics. Then [the principal] is called to the office to meet with the Superintendent, who wants to discuss plans and logistics for the visit of the Chancellor-designate on December 1. (Having two major events that involve parents and outside guests in one week is a tall order, even for this school which mounts impressive and elaborate programs regularly.) The assistant principal and the Community School coordinator continue organizing the children and welcoming the parents, of whom there are 40-50 in attendance.

The program consists of the Pre-Kindergarten and Bilingual Kindergarten classes dancing to recorded music, each group of children being led up to the stage from their seats under the direction of their teacher, who has chosen and directed their particular *performance. Several classes sing in Spanish, one Pre-Kindergarten child dances to "Singing in the Rain," each of the children wearing a yellow rain slicker and carrying a striped umbrella. The parents are wildly enthusiastic, cheering and clapping and going to the front to snap photos. Two of the seven classes that perform are exceptionally well-prepared and disciplined, a number of the others are mostly cute.*

All of the members of the Community School Advisory Committee have been invited to attend, and I see at least six of them, several of whom appear to have brought guests. Separately, two of these visitors comment to me that they wished the schools they were associated with had this kind of warmth and enthusiasm.

The children's program is broken by a long series of formal (and heart-felt) thanks to the representatives of the Gould Foundation, who in turn make remarks, which are in turn translated into Spanish. Gifts are presented by the president of the Parents Association.

There is much reference to Puerto Rican heritage and culture; the backdrop for the entire morning's program is a painting done by the students which shows a large figure of an indigenous man standing on a green mountain top. He is holding a staff and looking out over a bay of blue water. Far in the distance, represented by very small white dots, a number of sailing ships approach the island . . .

The second half of the program consists of an extremely well-done bilingual drama, "The Magic Coqui," by a large group of kids from the junior high across the street. They have been working with the same actor-dancer team from the Community Action Theater that works extensively at the school. This is the first time in the year that I have been visiting this school that I have seen a collaborative program of this sort. The audience, including the littlest children who have been sitting for nearly four hours, loves this performance and the applause is long. The program—this part of which has been predominantly in Spanish—closes with the chorus from the elementary school going to the front of the room and singing "It's a Small World After All."

All visitors are invited to lunch in the principal's office, children return to their classrooms in a noisy but quite disciplined fashion, many of the parents stop off in the Community School room as they are leaving.

Some months later, the same school mounted another performance:

May 4, 19__

Pan American Day

This is one of the extravaganza programs that I have come to understand are relatively ordinary parts of the life of this school. A large group of parents and the third, fourth and fifth grades (more than 300 children) are gathered in the auditorium by ten o'clock to watch the performances that are officially called "Latin American Dance and Poetry Review." Unlike other programs, however, this one is not simply a class by class presentation of something that the teacher has chosen and rehearsed. This is the culmination, mostly in the form of dances from selected Latin countries, of work done by two talented artist/teachers from the . . . Action Theater Company. These teachers were able to begin work at [the school] because of the Community School extended day programs last year, and they are now working in the school on a regular basis as well. The children perform extremely well—the dancing is amazing—and the high quality of sets and costumes makes the whole thing quite professional.

During the dancing and reading of poems, slides are projected onto either wall of the auditorium showing various images: a bare-chested man with indeterminate Indian features on horseback on a beautiful beach, or a glistening lake set in the mountains. The children go wild with clapping and chants every time a new slide appears and the person with the mike says, "And now, we take you to Columbia . . . to Nicaragua . . . to Puerto Rico . . . to Cuba!" (This experience goes with the one that I described as "Deconstructing Columbus" last fall.) Three boys from a neighboring school read a poem after their teacher has explained that none of the boys has been in the States even as long as a year: one is Panamanian, one Dominican, one from Ecuador. (This seems noteworthy in part because programs at [the school] never contextualize this way, despite a strong cultural emphasis, nor do they identify individual children much at all.)

The sound equipment breaks down a number of times during the performance. Everyone is good humored while teachers cruise the auditorium holding two fingers in the air in V's and attempting to quiet the river of sound that rises from the children every few minutes. At one point the director of the . . . Action Theater takes the mike to tell the kids to settle down and explains that the equipment isn't great because a lot of good rental places won't take checks from the Board of Education.

After the show a number of visitors gather in the principal's office and I realize that the whole thing is going to happen again, this time with an audience of younger children as well as the visitors. Two guests from the District are being particularly honored and thanked, [the] Director of Communication Arts, and [the] Deputy Superintendent. They are joined by [the] Assemblyman, who is a frequent visitor at [the school], and everyone is invited to stay for lunch after the next performance. [1025490]

Two years later, another observer at this school reported a

Pan American Day Celebration.

The school was in a flurry. The school was celebrating Pan American Day and an all school assembly program had been organized. Several persons were bring honored, including: the Community School coordinator; the school Dietitian; the director of Bilingual Education for the NYC school system; and a parent. There was a great deal of pomp: a Congressman came; principals from other schools in the district; community organization representatives; parents and students. The teachers of two bilingual classes had obviously worked to achieve the quality of the program produced . . . The principal seems to relish in the joy of having "events" for the school, as evidenced by the celebration. The parents had prepared a veritable feast, fruit and coffee were available in the Principal's office and entertainment had been provided by the children. [1025192]

It has seemed useful to quote at such length from observers' reports in this instance as "culture," like "community," is a highly charged word with many meanings. The Regents could have meant by it the "high culture" of traditional Manhattan institutions. They could have meant the "culture of the community" in which the schools are located. The observations indicate that the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program interpreted this Criterion as pointing to the latter definition, which is not to say that they did not sponsor activities congruent with the other possible definition, but that these tended to be seen as "regular school" activities, rather than matters specifically associated with the State intervention.

There is no evidence that the State Education Department specifically intervened to communicate or support particular definitions of "cultural" activities, or to modify the way in which these often serve more as entertainment for adults than as education for children.

Criterion 5 is:

A school acting as broker for health, nutritional, and social services, making them accessible on the school site to children and their families.

Under the headings of "clinic," and "dental," we find that at Pine Street Elementary School, in December, 1988, *"Dental care is provided at the New Your University Dental clinic,"* and the following March that *"there is a health clinic that holds AIDS prevention classes for parents in the school." "[T]here is a real push in regard to dental to be done through Floating Hospital,"* and in December, 1989, *"The teachers' defined needs as requested by the principal [included] health out-reach, glasses, dental."* In November, 1991, an observer at Pine Street Elementary School found a *"Dental Clinic at the school five half-days a week,"* but in March, 1991, we learn that *"The school has lost its dental program,"* and in February, 1992, it was reported that *"Nurse, dental and school psychiatrist space has been given to the District drug program,"* although by June, 1992, dental services were again available at the school, one day a week.

After a long and difficult process of negotiations with State agencies, a Mt. Sinai Pediatric Health Center opened at Elm Street Elementary School in June, 1990, *"with a clinic and social worker." "The funding from the State Health Department took two years to arrange,"* according to the hospital representative. A teacher at Oak Street Elementary School took an observer *"to the newly established Community Health Center, staffed by a Pediatric Nurse Practitioner and a Health Aide . . . a heart specialist, dentist, mental health person come in once a month, so this could truly be a one stop service center for all the families in this area."* And it was noted that the school had a clinic on-site, *"in full operation,"* by October, 1991. The principal commented that help for this clinic and the ABE program came not from the State, but from the Community School District. The clinic was an out-reach site of Long Island Hospital. In November, 1991, it was noted as open and busy all day. In January, 1992, a *"funding cut-back resulted in most Community Schools funding going to the clinic,"* underlining an earlier observation that teachers and administrators found the clinic to be the most valuable aspect of the Community Schools Program at Oak Street Elementary School.

Under the general heading of "health," we find that at Elm Street Elementary School, *"the provision of expanded health services on site [was] the Advisory Council's highest priority for the coming year,"* in June, 1989. At the time there was *"a series of parent workshops and classes, such as pre-natal and infant health care and life skills"* at the school. In December, 1989, the school was *"trying to finalize some health services linkages, especially vision services with SUNY"*. At Pine Street Elementary School, in January, 1990, *"There is a school nurse four hours weekly, and she is paid with Department of Health funds."* A *"medical room for the school health program [run by] Jamaica Hospital"* was seen at Ash Street Elementary School, in March, 1990. Cedar Street Elementary

School had *"some health and social services available on site through the Children's Aid Services"* in June, 1990. In general, however, at this school *"Health is a big concern . . . [and] there are no adequate health services available for children or families."* An observer noted in January, 1992, that there had been *"no on-site health care over the period"* of observation at Pine Street Elementary School.

The Community Schools have taken this point very seriously and many have made extensive efforts to meet the Criterion. It could be said that the intention of each part of the Criterion has been met by one or more of the schools.

Most of the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program attempted to provide on-site health services, and some, for a time, have succeeded. However, this accomplishment has been very difficult to put in place and to sustain. It has not occurred at all the sites, and it has not always been stable at those sites where it has occurred. Some schools seeking to become sites for accessible health services for children and their families have had to spend years working their way through State and City procedures to do so, and even when successful have found that these successes are often evanescent.

The State Education Department's Community Schools Program has been even less successful in having schools become sites for social services for their children and their families.

The Gould Foundation considered the establishment of "linkages" between the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program and the relevant New York City agencies to be an important part of their technical assistance charge, which they attempted to meet during the time of their contract by setting up meetings and publishing a guide to available services. An example of this effort appears in the Chronological Observation Record when an *"observer went to the Gould Foundation for a meeting of five Community Schools with three HRA representatives, the Board of Education, and the New York State Education Department,"* in October, 1989. *"The HRA representatives discussed the welfare reforms in Income Maintenance and how to receive assistance in job hunting and in getting the proper job training . . . [a]ll the participants asked lots of questions of the people from*

HRA." In December, 1989, an observer at Elm Street Elementary School reported that *"The Community Schools representatives are excited about making connections and making them work and are conveying this to the representatives of HRA; HRA in turn is experiencing this openness and is responding positively."*

The reason for this excitement is pointed up by stories the same observer heard from the Community School coordinator at that school *"Parents tell her of their struggle with HRA . . . There are HRA programs to provide limited stipends for parents working in schools, however, [the Community School coordinator] has not managed to get through the bureaucracy and she states that the principal is too busy to help her."* In April, 1990, *"The [New York City] Community School coordinators [spoke] at length about how hard it is to get help from HRA unless you know specific individuals within the bureaucracy, and how discouraging it is . . ."* This set of observations is summarized by one from Elm Street Elementary School in June, 1991: "[S]ome *City agencies were supposed to help--haven't: Agency for Child Development, HRA, Housing, Income Maintenance . . ."*

The record concerning nutrition includes a comment from Elm Street Elementary School in June, 1991: *"[W]e feed kids, we feed breakfast to a lot of them, and lunch and snacks."* At Oak Street Elementary School an observer was told that *"The meals are provided by the Board of Education office of School Food and Nutrition."* The New York State Education Department's Community Schools Program is not mentioned in this connection.

Service

In general, the observations indicate that there has not been sustained support for the combined health, social, and nutrition services aspect of the program from the State or from the City and that schools on their own cannot be expected to accomplish such a complex undertaking in an unfavorable policy and fiscal climate.

If the Community Schools Program is to achieve its service goals, the following is indicated:

Recommendation

- Collaboration among State and New York City agencies to deliver basic, social, and health services to the students and their families at each Community School, mandated by the Governor and the State Legislature.

Community Involvement

The Regents' Criteria that can be grouped under the heading of *Community Involvement* include:

7. Productive linkages with nearby community colleges, other higher education institutions, business, community based organizations, cultural institutions, churches, temples, and other agencies and institutions.

8. Parents actively involved in school affairs, helping with their own and other children and pursuing their own education.

9. A diversified program team, including teachers, teaching assistants and/or aides, parents and/or other adult mentors, college-age students, etc.

Let us begin with the first of these, Criterion 7:

Productive linkages with nearby community colleges, other higher education institutions, business, community based organizations, cultural institutions, churches, temples, and other agencies and institutions.

Most of the Community Schools have devoted significant efforts to developing "productive linkages with nearby community colleges, other higher education institutions, business, community based organizations, cultural institutions, churches, temples, and other agencies and institutions." It might even be said that this has been the central impetus of the Community Schools Program at many of the schools. In the first years of the initiative it was significantly facilitated by technical assistance from the Gould Foundation.

The usual manifestation of this effort was the State-mandated advisory council of each Community School. These councils typically included representatives from local institutions and local representatives of city-wide or state institutions. Representatives of local political office-holders were prominent in some of these councils.

There is only one definite reference to *business* linkages in the Evaluation's Chronological Observation Record; it concerns the donation of t-shirts for fund-raising events. It appears that New York City Community Schools do not find themselves in a context where businesses are part of the lives of the schools. That context is noticeably one of bureaucracies, in the first instance the New York City Public Schools itself, but including non-educational governmental departments—chiefly the New York City Human Resources Administration—and non-governmental agencies, such as community-based organizations. Given this context, efforts at cooperation were not notably successful. According to an observer at Elm Street Elementary School in October, 1990, *"Public assistance bureaucracy publicly says that it does not encourage parents to pursue post-secondary education."* An observer at Elm Street Elementary School wrote in November, 1990, that *"these agencies had proven useless; that every time an attempt was made to contact them for assistance, the school person in charge--the parent coordinator--was given a run-around . . . It was our impression that the former parent coordinator, after trying unsuccessfully to establish linkages with the HRA, had provided a kind of ad hoc service to take care of the kinds of needs"* for which assistance had been sought from HRA.

Concerning Criterion 8,

Parents actively involved in school affairs, helping with their own and other children and pursuing their own education,

many of the schools have been quite successful in promoting the involvement of parents. Parents are in the schools, quite visibly. Parent volunteers are in classrooms and in school offices. Parents are invited to serve as audiences for student performances. Parents sometimes are simply in the schools, where rooms are set aside for their use. And, as we have seen, there are classes in the schools for parents, among other adults from the community.

These aspirations are reflected in a comment from 1988, when the Community School coordinator at Pine Street Elementary School wrote that: *"We would like to develop a program that involves parents in the classroom, whereby the teacher and parent work cooperatively on educational goals, and the parent is more aware of the academic life of the child . . ."*. In December, 1988, an observer found ESL classes for parents at Elm Street Elementary School, also something called *"Family Science—parents and children work on Science . . . [it was] put in late in the year, last year, planned for this year."* The following January an observer at Pine Street Elementary School noted that *"There is a parents room on the first floor, close to the entrance—music is emanating from there with some parents dancing . . ."* At that time, at Pine Street Elementary

School, according to the observer, *"The Parents Association is not large, but those who are in it are cooperative . . . A few parents volunteer, usually for breakfast and lunch programs . . . There is an unspoken division among the three [ethnic] groups of parents."* In February, 1989, an observer at the school noted that the *"Social Worker has parent meetings every other Friday morning and the Family Worker translates . . .".* The following month another observer at the school wrote that *"Parent involvement is a strength in the development of the Community School project . . . [it] is the most exciting and daily activity; this would not happen if this were not a Community School".* A group called *"Parent Volunteers [was] put together by the Community School coordinator, but parents take great responsibility . . ."* Also in March, 1989, an observer at Pine Street Elementary School noted that *"The Community School coordinator is very involved with parents . . . The scene most typical of Pine Street Elementary School: administrative involvement with parents."* (An observer at Ash Street Community School wrote in June, 1989, that *"Important factors in [the] success of the project at the school [include] parent and community participation, administration and district support . . . ")* Interestingly, *"Parents don't want remuneration for working at school; it will take incomes over eligibility line for public assistance."* At that time there was an impression at Pine Street Elementary School *"that the Community School project is located in a particular room; a physical space that represents the Community School project and serves the parents".*

An observer at Elm Street Elementary School described this scene in the same month: *"The women in the Community School room, who are active as parent volunteers and leaders of the Parents Association, were in an uproar because a nearby gang had started chasing children "running them," as they say . . . The uproar led to organizing groups to protect the children getting out of school that afternoon, and I recognized the significance of active parent leadership in a community such as this . . . Virtually all the parent volunteers are women, but there is a significant group of men at all the meetings called by the school . . . If it were possible to pay parent volunteers for any of their work at the school, there would be many benefits, including the possibility of recruiting more participation and supporting community outreach . . . It will be critical to watch how parent involvement affects the academic lives of the children, whether it affects only those children whose parents are themselves active . . .".* There seems to have been a difference of opinion among the observers concerning the issue of remuneration for parental involvement.

At Elm Street Elementary School, in June, 1989, an observer wrote that *"Not surprisingly, parents seem to feel that the school is an accessible place . . . the priorities of the Community School . . . do reflect the needs and wishes of the parents and others who constitute the community. Those needs and wishes are for a safe, open, clean* *school where children and parents can be active in meaningful ways for a significant portion of the week and year, be in at least minimally better contact with vital social services, and participate in programs in which parents can develop their skills . . ."* In August, 1989, an observer at Pine Street Elementary School noted that *"The school has hired a parent to coordinate the after-school program, which works well . . ."* While, on the other hand, an observer at Elm Street Elementary School wrote that there *"[the] teachers believe parents are negatively intrusive . . ."*. In November it is noted that *"the person in charge of the Parent Out Reach program is in the school and is much more interested in involving the parents in planning"* at Pine Street Elementary School . . . *"More parents are becoming involved with more programs . . ."*, while another observer at the school noted that *"parents help out around the school, answer the telephone, meet with parents who come to the school for teacher meetings . . . [d]uring the frequent events with politicians visiting, large groups of children performing, lunch [is] catered by small groups of parents."* The following month, the Community School coordinator at Elm Street Elementary school was quoted as saying that *"There are HRA programs to provide limited stipends for parents working in schools, however, she has not managed to get through the bureaucracy and she states that the principal is too busy to help her."* Again, there appears to have been a feeling in some of the schools that parents should be paid for their involvement.

In April, 1990, an observer at a meeting of Community School coordinators from the New York City sites noted that *"The Community School coordinators are busy discussing how their programs are going, particularly how enormous the job of parent coordinating is . . . this involves both servicing parents' needs in a number of classes and programs, and organizing the work of a substantial group of parent volunteers who contribute significantly to the daily life and parent leadership of the school and welcome new parents . . . The decision to hire a full-time parent coordinator this year and the fact that the person hired is excellent, has indeed freed the Community School coordinator to concentrate more on the academic program,"* and other responsibilities. In May, 1990, an observer at Elm Street Elementary School noted that *"Usually, the parent meeting consists of workshops on building positive images, drug prevention, issues of the day, and some crafts, such as clay, arts and crafts, painting t-shirts . . ."*. And the same month, an observer at Ash Street Elementary School found that *"Meetings are planned . . . one in the morning and one in the evening, as workshops for the parents to help them to assist the children with their school work."* In June, 1990, an Observer at Cedar Elementary School learned that there *"Parents volunteer to work two hours a month and are reimbursed with forty dollars worth of groceries for twelve dollars,"* which was one approach to the issue of parental remuneration (although the use of the word "volunteer" in this context is slightly odd).

Parental involvement can be especially valuable under the unusual circumstances pertaining in some of the Community Schools Program neighborhoods in New York City. We have this revealing note from October, 1991: "[The area around the school] *is a major drug dealing center, and on weekends parents at times have been trapped in the building's halls as they tried to avoid gunshots fired outside"* Elm Street Elementary School. In September, 1990, at Elm Street Elementary School, *"There was a shooting this morning and the parents on the team instruct the teachers never to let the children wait outside."*

Parental involvement is a Community Schools Program goal, but all parental involvement in the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program is not automatically to be attributed to the Community Schools Program. In December, 1990, an observer at Pine Street Elementary School wrote that the *"Hispanic parent organization's power pre-dates the Community School project,"* while another observer at the same school noted that *"parent involvement [is] being consciously reduced with the transition from the first Community School coordinator to the second . . . [there is] still much parent presence at school, but no longer formal and connected to the Community School project."*

In the 1990-91 and 1991-92 school years, there continued to be many citations of parental activity in the Chronological Observation Record. At the Pine Street Elementary School, an observer wrote in February, 1991, that the head *"of the parent association is a longtime school activist, with multiple children and child surrogates, but no child of her own in the school at that time."* Later that Spring, a teacher at Pine Elementary School said that the *"Pre-Kindergarten has more opportunities for parent involvement and that parents assist in the room and on trips."* In October of that year, an observer at Elm Street Elementary school noted that *"now there are twenty parent volunteers who are here every day."* During the same month, an observer at Oak Street Elementary School wrote that the *"Parent Room always has someone in it; some parents help with school clerical tasks."* And in February, 1992, there is a scene from Oak Street Elementary School, where the *"teacher, a para-professional, and a parent are assisting small groups of children, or individual children, in either prepared academic work, or in play."* In March, 1991, an observer at Elm Street Elementary School wrote that a *"change of coordinators has led to a less visible role for parents, although there is still an active parents' group."* A teacher from Elm Street Elementary School is quoted in a field note from May, 1991, as saying that *"'It really helps me in the classroom if parents know what we are doing; they do stuff at home; they get to know me and the way I teach.' Asked to describe the school she says that 'it is ALIVE, there is energy everywhere, and there are parents everywhere, not just in the parents' room, but everywhere in the school.'"*

Another aspect of parent involvement in Community Schools was recorded by an observer at Pine Street Elementary School, who thought in September 1991, that *"There was a subtle innuendo about the need for the parents to assist the acting principal to become the permanent principal."* The ultimate development of parental involvement in a Community School occurred in May, 1992, when the president of the Parents Association at Pine Street Elementary School became the Community School coordinator. In June, 1992, an observer at Elm Street Elementary School attributed that school's "excellent parent involvement" to the "effective" full-time parent coordinator. That month the school held a program to

> *present parents awards for their contribution to the school and to also introduce the newly elected parent officers. [One] indicated that he was rearing he daughter alone, and he was a constant visitor to the school and he has attended several parent workshops, including a citywide workshop which had been conducted by the central Board of Education. When asked how he liked the school, he indicated that the school develops not only children, but also parents. He said that he had moved his daughter to the school after the had read articles about the school. One of the parents who was honored had completed her B.S. degree. She had been a volunteer at the Early Childhood Center, became a Para-professional, and commenced her studies while she was in that position. It was interesting to note the support she was provided by [the] director of the Early Childhood Center, who said that the women must advance themselves in spite of husbands who were opposed to them receiving more education. The program consisted of poetry reading executed in English and Spanish. . . From an earlier assessment, I became aware of the various kinds of parental educational and craft activities at the center. Gifts were given to the former officers and probably 25 certificates were given to parents. The current and former parent boards were racially mixed. (I asked [the principal] about the relationships between the African and Latino parents. She responded that she had formed a Black Caucus group and met with them alone to ascertain their issues.) [The former] president . . . and a "Fantastic Fund-raiser" will be paid as a mentor to the new board for leadership training and will continue to work with parents.* [10161692]

Criterion 9 calls for

> ***A diversified program team, including teachers, teaching assistants and/or aides, parents and/or other adult mentors, college-age students, etc.***

The term "program team" refers to the shared decision-making group in schools organized to have them. It may also refer to a Community Schools statutory advisory committee. All the New York City Community Schools have the latter; a few have the former. In both cases the groups were highly diversified (with the exception of college-age students, who were nowhere present).

Advisory committees have a long history in the Community Schools Program, with varying charters depending on the direction of the Community Schools Program at any given moment. They were considered essential at the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program during the first year or two of activity. The Advisory Council at Elm Street Elementary School, for example, was observed in the 1988-1989 school year to include a broad representation from community-based organizations and local governmental institutions, from local clinics to the police, parents, teachers, school administrators, etc. An early meeting of the Elm Street Elementary School Advisory Council had an agenda including introductions, brief statements of support and encouragement, the showing of the video "No Time to Lose," and a discussion. This group was perhaps best characterized as a liaison entity. It was not a managerial committee, or even a policy committee. An observer noted in June, 1989, that *"The Advisory Council meets regularly, with a shifting membership in attendance, but with an increasingly cohesive group that is committed to sharing information and resources."* The Elm Street Elementary School group at that time was referred to as a "council," rather than as a committee, which may have been meant to emphasize its role in bringing together a broad group of representatives from both inside and outside of the school. Its mission was characterized by an observer at that time as including *"the development of resource networks based in the [area and] the generation of public support . . ."* The Community School coordinator was quoted as saying that the *"first task of the Advisory Council is to share resources and network among its members . . ."* At that time, it was believed at the school that *"The Advisory Council, may be the structure, with parent participation, that most distinguishes Elm Street Elementary School as a Community School."* And, a final comment on the Advisory Council of Elm Street Elementary School that first year: *"The Advisory Council has concentrated less on the direct delivery of educational and social services to children or to the community, than on the building of networks . . . When the advisory group was asked to evaluate their own progress and identify goals for next year, the highest priority was to have expanded health care available at the school site."*

The activity of the Advisory Council of Elm Street Elementary School was noted to diminish with time. In May, 1990, an observer wrote: "Thinking *back to our categories, I realize that the Advisory Council is the one area in which Elm Street Elementary School seems to have been less active this year . . .*". And then, in March, 1991: "The *Advisory Council has receded*".

Membership of these committees was a matter of wide variation and some debate. The Community School District teachers union representative there commented in June of 1989: *"I had to fight for a year to get onto the Advisory Committee, and I'm the* *only educator there."* But three years later, there is a note from an observer at Pine Street Elementary School that *"The Community School has an Advisory Board [sic] that will be expanded to include the teachers union consultation committee."* And in May, 1992, an observer wrote that *"The school's advisory committee [sic] is the principal and three other staff, including the teachers union representative—no regular teachers or parents."* On the other hand an observer noted that Pine Street Elementary School included students on its committee in the 1988-1989 school year. An observer at Ash Street Elementary School noted in March, 1990 that there *"is an Advisory Council for the Community School: Principal, Assistant Principal, community leaders, Community School coordinator, parents, teachers, and it meets once a month."* This is a more inward looking configuration. The Oak Street Elementary School "Advisory Board" in October, 1991, includes *"three or four CBO's, the principal, the Community School coordinator, the Community School District teachers union teacher representative, an Early Childhood specialist . . .".*

Community Involvement

In general, the observations indicate that parents have been involved in the schools. The range of parental activity in the Community Schools has run the full gamut from participation on school-based management/shared-decision making committees, to paid and volunteer work in school offices and classrooms, to the simple fact of their presence in the ubiquitous "parents' rooms" in the schools. This involvement was encouraged by the Community School coordinators at the New York City sites of the Community Schools Program. It had, on the other hand, pre-existed the Community Schools Program at some sites, and has tended to lessen as the emphasis of the Community Schools Program has shifted toward academic achievement.

Conclusions

The Community Schools Program of the New York State Education Department has had as a goal the provision of a normative education to children who do not always acquire such an education, and thus was challenged to transform schools funded for this task into good schools, capable of achieving this goal, and supporting them with comprehensive school-site health, social, and nutrition services for those children in need of them. Has the Community Schools Program given rise to good schools, where the challenges of acculturation and provision of basic services are overcome? Has the Community Schools Program supported activities in the funded schools, so that the New York State Education Department's criteria for Community Schools could be met?

The findings presented above, and the research from which they were drawn, indicate that the instructional and curricular programs of schools supported by the New York State Education Department were improved by the provision of Pre-Kindergarten at all the schools, where that would not necessarily have been the case without the program. In some schools, some students benefited from some special programs, such as Studio-In-A-School and those of the College for Human Services, which would not necessarily have been the case without State intervention. But, in general, it must be said that the Community Schools Program has not improved the instructional and curricular programs of the schools it has funded. In the same way, the professionalism of educators in these schools has been, in some places, at some times, positively affected by the program, but in general, there have not been systematic changes that could be attributed to the State's intervention. Services for students and services for the community, which were the original rationale for the program, embodying a strategy of using school sites as locations for comprehensive health and social services, have not been improved across the board or in a sustained manner. The strategy of having school-based administrators, Community Schools coordinators, "broker" the services of state and local agencies, has not proven effective. Those agencies have their own priorities, and Community Schools coordinators have been unable to exert sufficient leverage, in a general and sustained fashion, to change those priorities. And, to their credit, community involvement has been a characteristic of the schools funded under the Community Schools Program. Unfortunately, this has tended to drop off over time, being dependent on the talents and energies of individual administrators, rather than on a systematic pattern of intervention by the State.

There is much to be learned from the experience of the New York State Education Department's Community Schools Program over the past ten years. Perhaps some of those lessons can be summarized in a sentence or two here. If schools are to be the sites of comprehensive social and health services for students and their families, the agencies controlling the relevant resources must be responsible for accomplishing that aim. It cannot be done over time and systematically by school-site staff. If schools are to improve their educational programs, they need the support of expert technical assistance and appropriate funding, both for program development, and for the implementation of new and more extensive programs. A few "retreats" and the occasional meeting will not suffice. And, finally, merely keeping the doors of the school house open does not necessarily lead to more education for students. A community schools program is an ambitious venture, promising to substantially change the nature of schools. It deserves a central place in the priorities of the state and local authorities responsible for the education and welfare of children. It is unfortunate that the New York State Education Department's Community Schools Program, with its history of administrative turmoil and relatively insufficient funding, does not appear to have been such a central priority.

Recommendations

- **Technical assistance to help schools funded under the Community Schools Program to become capable of structuring teaching and learning so that students will be able to meet appropriate outcome standards.** If it is found that the State Education Department itself has insufficient expertise or staffing to deliver this technical assistance, there are a number of organizations that can be contracted to do so.

- **Collaboration among State and New York City agencies to deliver basic, social, and health services to the students and their families at each Community School.** This would entail action by the Governor and the State Legislature. It has been sufficiently demonstrated that it cannot be done by bottom-up brokering; nor can the State Education Department be tasked to ensure collaboration among its fellow agencies. The cost of such real operational collaboration would be essentially a reallocation of existing expenditures.

- **Extension of integrated school academic programs, increasing time for academic study for all students attending Community Schools, each day, each week, all year.** Achievement of this goal would entail cooperation between the State Education Department, the New York City Public Schools, and the various employee groups involved. The expense involved would be directly proportionate to the amount of time added to the education of students.

- **The definition and implementation of valid and reliable student achievement assessment measures, performance tasks, asking students to demonstrate what they know and what they can do in the major subject areas.** This could be done by the State Education Department without major increases in funding.

Methodology

The Bruner Foundation has a particular interest in the methodology of evaluation, particularly as applied to school programs.

The task of evaluation is complex and is perhaps needlessly complicated by the belief that the choice of methodology is obvious and singular. In the matter of the evaluation of education programs, the methodology of choice is often the deceptively "objective" standardized, norm-referenced, pre- and post- test scores. Surveys of certain stakeholders might be added as a reasonably popular second choice. And administrative and financial descriptions might appear in an evaluation document, often without being explicitly identified as evaluation criteria. In contrast, the account of the New York State Education Department's Community Schools Program given here is based, in the first instance, on observations in schools by multiple experienced observers, trained in a variety of traditions, over time. The resulting chronological observation record of approximately two hundred school site visits has been supplemented by papers from teacher research seminars, and a statistical analysis of standard data streams made available to the public by the New York Public Schools, including reading and mathematics scores, attendance statistics, and similar data. The observations and statistical analyses have been supplemented by an analysis of the historical development of the Community Schools Program, interviews with school personnel, Community School District administrators, union officials, officials of the State Education Department, people from community-based organizations, foundations, and those with similar responsibilities in other cities and states.

The observers contributing to the Evaluation included classically trained anthropologists, education ethnographers, educators working in the tradition of Patricia Carini's long-term studies of children in schools in Vermont and New York state, and others. Some of the observers visited individual schools a few times a week over three years, others used different data collection strategies, spending days at a time in individual classrooms, or visiting many schools from time to time: talking with teachers, administrators, and parents. Some of the observers convened teacher-research seminars at some of the school sites, facilitating the possibility of school communities themselves participating in the evaluation. Others conducted interviews with State Education Department officials in Albany and New York City, as well as interviews with New York City Public School administrators at all levels, members of Community School advisory committees, representatives of community-based organizations and other groups associated with the Community School sites in New York City and elsewhere in the state. Some observers took particular care to develop relationships with Community School coordinators, interviewing them frequently and at length. There were regular staff meetings of the observers and others involved in the Evaluation and regular meetings of the Evaluation's Advisory Committee, members of which also contributed observations about the Community Schools Program, its context, similar programs in New York and elsewhere. ERIC and other databases were explored in relevant subject areas, foundation and education officials in many states were contacted for information that concerning collaborative social service initiatives, educational reform, the theory and practice of school change.

Observations were completed in June, 1992. Data concerning the observations were compiled and converted to computer-readable form, then edited in order to standardize formats. This data consisted of formal reports, field notes, transcripts of meetings, and the like. As would be expected, in addition to descriptive prose, the data included judgments and evaluative comments by the observers. These explicitly valued statements themselves became data for analysis, pointing to what expert and experienced observers of schools took to be important or normative or unusual. A million words of this material were then arranged chronologically into the basic Chronological Observation Record. The Chronological Observation Record was not coded, but was simply converted into the working text for the Oxford Concordance Program, which was programmed to produce key word in context concordances from the Chronological Observation Record. The key words were drawn from the New York State Education Department's list of characteristics of Community Schools, and from other lists suggested by the Advisory Committee and from an analysis of terms in the total vocabulary of the Chronological Observation Record. For example, the words "parent," "parents," and "parental," were used as keywords, so that every instance of their use in the Chronological Observation record was retrieved, in chronological order, with indications of the observer making the record, the date of the record, and the school observed.

This process allowed for the retrospective compilation of accounts of typical, or atypical, "scenes" of everyday life in the schools, over time, by many observers. (A few cases of keywords of no seeming relevance were also run, in order to test the comprehensiveness of the analysis.) These scenes were then analyzed by the evaluator (as they could be by any reader of the material), for evidence pertaining to the effects of the Community Schools Program on that aspect of school life. It is highly unlikely that any common effect of the Community Schools Program was not charted in this way.

The Advisory Committee of the Evaluation gave very serious consideration to the question of how much effort to devote to the collection and analysis of quantitative data derived from conventional school data series. The Committee was not opposed to quantitative data *per se,* believing that quantified performance assessment measures, for example, could be valid and reliable indicators of the success of teaching and learning strategies, if properly analyzed and combined with ethnographic, historical, and critical analyses. However, given the absence of such data for students in the New York City schools under consideration, and given the expense and intrusion that would be associated with introducing such measures, the Committee believed that observation over time by many observers trained in a variety of ways was the preferable data collection strategy, both in regard to validity and reliability. And yet, the Committee understood that many who might be interested in the Bruner Foundation's work on the Community Schools Program would expect to see quantitative data and analysis. It was decided to undertake the collection and analysis of quantitative data in order to satisfy such readers, but only on the conditions that the collection would not be intrusive and that the presentation of the data would not take a form that would contradict the Committee's belief in the secondary nature of quantitative data drawn from standardized tests.

Therefore, Eileen Foley was asked to undertake a study of that relevant data series concerning the schools in question. Her full report is available from the Bruner Foundation. (*The Bruner Foundation's Evaluation of the New York State Community Schools Program, The Archive: Part II.*) The following pages drawn from that report describe her methodology and summarize her conclusions (which have been referred to, from time to time, above). Concerning the data and her methodology, Ms Foley writes:

> Each school in this analysis is treated as a case. Each case analysis starts with a review of data describing students and teachers in the school. Student variables presented include the following: October 31 school register, the percent of students who are African-American and the percent of students who are Hispanic, the percent of students receiving free or reduced price lunch; the percent of students in the terminal grade in elementary school in one year who were in attendance in the same school two years earlier. Teacher variables presented in each case include the percent of teachers teaching two years or less; average number of teacher absences per year, and percent of teachers who are serving as temporary per diems, whether certified or uncertified . . .

To assess changes on standardized tests associated with participation in the Community Schools [Program], three kinds of analyses were performed: annual analyses, cohort analyses, and residual analyses . . . The first set of analyses looks at the performance of students in target schools on the Degrees of Reading Power (DRP) reading test and the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) in mathematics over five years. Student performance in school districts in which the Community Schools reside and student performance in the city as a whole are also examined to identify, for comparative purposes, broader achievement trends.

The scale used to judge student progress over time is the percentage of students who reach the 50th percentile (national norms) on the DRP and MAT. The period of analysis is 1986-87 through 1990-91, year one of the program through year five.

In tables displaying the data, two different reading test scores are presented for 1987-88. The Board of Education adopted new test norms at that point. The first 1987-88 reading score specifies the percentage of students who would have reached the State's competency level if norms in use until that point had been applied. The second score specifies the percentage of students who reached the competency level under the new norms. A much lower percentage of students reached competency under the new 1987-88 norms.

The Community Schools serve students who are poorer and further behind in reading and mathematics than students in their schools districts [with one exception] and the city overall. Outcomes are generally judged positive, therefore, when gaps in performance between the school and the district/city decrease on most (at least three of the four) occasions for which we have data. Occasionally, the target school outperforms the district/city from the outset of the analysis. When this is the case and there is greater poverty in the school than in the comparison case (district/city), the school must simply continue to outperform the district/city to constitute success. For the purpose of this analysis, the difference between school and district/city scores must change by more than one-half a percentage point to be considered a meaningful change.

This analysis of "gaps" attempts to account for the fact that student test scores may improve over time in schools for a variety of reasons that have nothing to do with the intervention studied. For example, when the Board of Education administered the MAT over two sittings, rather than in one sitting as it had done historically, scores on the MAT increased citywide. Studying progress in community schools in relation to overall trends in the city and districts helps to discount the effect of events unrelated to the program such as that.

Given the instability of student populations in city schools, changes in the characteristics of pupils attending the target schools may affect student performance on standardized tests. To address reasonable concerns about the influence of population shifts on student scores, two additional sets of analyses were performed: cohort analyses and residual analyses . . .

The first set of cohort analyses report on the scores of students in the terminal grade of their school in 1990 who had been in the school since 1988. The second set report on the scores of students in the terminal grade of their school in 1991 who had been in the school since 1989. The quarter placement (e.g. first quarter, second quarter, etc.) of persisters in year one on standardized tests is compared with their quarter placement two years later. Performance in each target school is compared with performance in the resident school district and the city as a whole.

The strength of the cohort analysis is that the analysis reflects the performance of a single group of students over time, thereby alleviating concern about the effects of population shifts on student performance. In this study, however, because the cohorts in question are generally less that 20% of the population of the target schools, the strength of the analysis is mitigated by small sample sizes.

Another limitation of the cohort analysis has to do with a statistical phenomenon known as "regression to the mean." Since, for the most part, a higher proportion of students are behind in the target schools than in the districts and the city, one would expect a higher proportion of students in the target schools to improve than in the city and in the districts . . . In such cases, judgment is used in assessing whether the difference between the performance of the school and the performance of the district/city is meaningful . . .

Multiple regression analyses are done to study the relationship between a single dependent variable, for example, the percentage of students reaching the 50th percentile on the DRP, and several independent variables, for example, the percentage of students in a school who are poor, the percentage of students who are of limited English proficiency, etc. A linear model can be built in which performance on dependent variables is predicted from the

> independent variables. A quantity called the "residual" is what's left over after the model is fit. A residual is the difference between the observed and predicted values of the dependent variables. If a school has 60% of its students reaching the 50th percentile and the model predicts 55%, then the residual for the case is 5. Five percentage points are left over or not explained by the model.
>
> The residual analysis is the strongest of the three analyses appearing in this study. Like the cohort analysis, the residual analysis overcomes the problem of instability across time in student populations. Unlike the cohort analysis, however, the residual analysis includes all test takers for each year in which the analysis is done, making the information provided by the residual analysis more reliable. In making judgments about school performance, residuals are used in two ways. First, residuals are examined to determine whether the schools in question are performing above or below expectation during the time of the program. Second, residuals are examined to determine whether performance, in relative terms, is improving over time or not.
>
> The residual analyses were performed using regression data made available by Professor Robert Berne of New York University. Data were available only for the 1987-88, 1988-89, and 1989-90 school years . . . To summarize broadly, the model serves to indicate whether performance improved in sites served by the Community schools Project beyond that observed in demographically comparable, non-served sites . . .
>
> Limited quantitative data were available through the *School Change Profiles* to assist efforts to determine if there were changes in the operating conditions of participating schools. One variable was selected for analysis--student attendance. Only an annual/gap analysis of the attendance data was feasible as the "School Profiles" do not include attendance cohort data and Professor Berne did not conduct regression studies with attendance as a dependent variable. The annual/gap analyses of attendance data are identical to the annual/gap analyses of reading and math data.

Concerning her findings, Ms Foley writes:

> . . . Demographic data . . . show that most students attending [New York City schools funded by the Community Schools Program] receive free lunch (77.0%--94.4%), and most are of either African-American or Hispanic background (68.9%--100.0%). The[se] schools serve more students who receive free lunch than the city overall (63.2%), and, except for [one], they serve more

> minority students than the city overall average (72.7%). The three-year student persistence rate in the[se] schools ranges from 56.3%--72.5%. The percentage of students persisting for three years in [these] schools is lower than the three-year persistence rate in the city overall (61.6%) with [two exceptions].
> The percentage of temporary per diem (TPD) teachers in the[se] schools ranges from 13.5% to 32.0%. There are as many [of these] schools with a higher percentage of TPDs than the citywide average (17.3%) as there are . . . with a lower percentage of TPDs than the citywide average. The percentage of teachers in the[se] schools who have been teaching in the schools two years or less ranges from 5.5% to 23.4%. Again, there are as many [of these] schools above the citywide average on this standard (19.7%) as below it. The average number of teacher absences at the[se] schools ranges from 6.7 to 9.5. With [two exceptions], there are more teacher absences in [these] schools than the citywide average (7.7%) . . .
>
> ***In all [these] schools aside from [one] student attendance is improving beyond the level of improvement found in the resident districts and the city. The data do not show any consistent improvement in standardized reading and math test scores beyond that occurring in the city and resident school districts.*** (Emphasis added.)

Foley found no positive effect on test scores that could be attributed to the Community Schools Program. She did note an improvement in attendance. This is an important effect, although not in itself one of the criteria designated by the State Education Department.

Teacher-researcher seminars at school-sites were another source of data. The Bruner Foundation believes that it is only fair for an evaluation to attempt to give something back to agencies participating in evaluations and that the staff of those agencies should be allowed an active role in an evaluation, if they wish it. It seemed that a good vehicle for accomplishing these purposes, while also serving as a means to capture yet other points of view, was to support teacher-research seminars in evaluation at those New York City Community Schools Program sites that wanted them. These seminars were active throughout the period of observation, included teachers and other school-site staff, and contributed uniquely to the perspective of the Evaluation.

Finally, a word about a methodology that was not used in the Evaluation. Some consideration was given to the use of surveys and structured interviews. These techniques were not used as data collection methods for the Evaluation. We are accustomed to evaluations that include structured interviews meant to ascertain the opinions of those involved in an institution or project. These procedures often have a certain face validity, enhanced by the use of scales of one kind or another for the responses. These scaled questions can be used to force choices and then allow the quantification of the data. The results can be presented in charts and tables, subjected to various statistical tests for reliability, and produce a high degree of confidence on the part of the investigator and user. And it seems perfectly natural to take this approach to program reviews, whether or not actual scaled responses are sought. Opinion and judgment are highly valued in this society, in their different ways. And yet, this practice can produce results ranging from the comparatively useless to the harmful. Its ***utility*** is called into question when it is applied to programs that are not primarily intended to affect the opinions of those questioned. In those cases, information about those opinions, no matter how carefully compiled and analyzed, is simply beside the point. The practice can be ***harmful***, because it can, under certain circumstances, call into being and then crystallize opinions that can then influence the program in question. Asking for opinions can create a climate of opinion. (Of course, in some contexts, this in itself can be a programmatic strategy.)

The methodology of this Evaluation is complex, expensive, time-consuming. On the other hand, it has achieved a certain depth of objectivity difficult to obtain in any other way. After three years of observation and a year or more of analysis of the data collected, we are confident that we know these schools, confident that we know how the Community Schools Program has affected them. Others engaged in the evaluation of school-change interventions or similar efforts may wish to consider this method, the division of evaluatory judgment from observation, the use of many observers (including participant observers) over time, the compilation of those observations in a single database, the structured analysis of that database.

NOTE

This report is based on a three-year study by the Bruner Foundation of that Project's activities in some public schools in New York City. The study was initiated at the suggestion of the late Martin Barell, at that time a member of the Board of Directors of the Bruner Foundation and Chancellor of the Board of Regents of the State of New York. Dr. Janet Carter, Executive Director of the Bruner Foundation, seized the opportunity to shape an evaluation that she hoped would contribute both to the Community Schools Program and to the state of the art in education evaluation. The distinguished advisory committee for the evaluation included Fran Barrett, Executive Director, Community Resources Exchange; Bertha Campbell, formerly Chief of Child Development and Parent Education Bureau, New York State Education Department (who also served as an observer); Dr. Edward Chittenden, Division of Education, Policy Research and Services, Educational Testing Service; Professor Michelle Fine, City University of New York, Graduate Center; Norman Fruchter, the Aaron Diamond Foundation; Dr. Dennis Palmer Wolf, Harvard University; Professor Herbert Zimiles, Arizona State University. The staff of the evaluation included Professor Deborah Allen, Kean College; Professor Nancy Barnes, the New School; Charlotte Brody; Dr. Suzanne Hanchett; Professor Clara Loomanitz, Brooklyn College, CUNY; Professor Kenneth J. Tewel, Queens College, CUNY; Dr. Eileen Foley, Fordham University. I would also like to thank the administrators, teachers, and staffs of those schools that participated in the evaluation, and particularly their Community School coordinators. The staff of New York State Education Department's units involved with the Community Schools Program have also been very cooperative in supporting this effort.

The opinions expressed here, and the errors, are those of the author.

Michael Holzman
September, 1993